

very potent means of ill will. That is one thing that I wish we might take steps to prevent to the extent it is now going on. [Applause.]

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 18, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII,

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (H. R. 7588) granting to the Vice President and Members of Congress the privilege of franking official correspondence not exceeding 1 ounce in weight by air mail, which was referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution dated October 10, 1939, with reference to national defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5802. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Resolution of the American Communications Association, Marine Local No. 6, T. J. Van Ermen, secretary, of Seattle, Wash., urging that Congress keep America out of war; maintain the Bill of Rights to protect labor's civil liberties against any and all emergency measures; and urging that belligerent resistance be made to all efforts to curtail, eviscerate, or destroy labor legislation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5803. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition containing answers to questions submitted to Bakery Drivers Local 276, American Federation of Labor, Los Angeles, Calif., by the Special Committee to Investigate the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend William S. Abernethy, D. D., minister, Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God. And because Thou art God, maker and upholder of the universe, the same yesterday, today, and forever, the Changeless One, we turn to Thee at this moment. When we feel our insufficiency, grant us wisdom. When we lose our way, be Thou our guide. When we are weak, make us strong.

In this hour of crisis, give to those who bear great responsibilities of state wisdom equal to the need. May the eyes of this Nation ever be turned Godward, we beseech Thee. Thou art our hope and our salvation. May we in this favored land not disappoint Thee. In the name of Christ, our Lord, we offer this prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day

Tuesday, October 17, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	King	Russell
Andrews	Donahey	La Follette	Schwartz
Austin	Downey	Lee	Schwellenbach
Bailey	Ellender	Lodge	Sheppard
Bankhead	Frazier	Lucas	Shipstead
Barbour	George	Lundeen	Slattery
Barkley	Gerry	McCarran	Smathers
Bilbo	Gibson	McKellar	Stewart
Borah	Gillette	McNary	Taft
Bridges	Green	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Guffey	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Gurney	Minton	Townsend
Burke	Hale	Murray	Truman
Byrd	Harrison	Neely	Tydings
Byrnes	Hatch	Norris	Vandenberg
Capper	Hayden	Nye	Van Nuys
Caraway	Herring	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Chandler	Hill	Overton	Walsh
Chavez	Holman	Pepper	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pittman	White
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

INVITATION TO ATTEND CONFERENCES ON INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL RELATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of State, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 16, 1939.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The series of conferences on inter-American cultural relations arranged by this Department has awakened such widespread interest in all parts of the country that I take pleasure in calling these gatherings to the attention of the Members of the Senate. The purpose of the conference is to enlist the cooperation of the leading private agencies in the United States toward the development of deeper and sounder understanding with the other American republics. I should like to invite all Members of the Senate to attend such of the sessions as may interest them.

The conferences are as follows:

October 18 and 19: Conference on inter-American relations in the field of music, to be held in the Whittall Pavilion, Library of Congress. A program is enclosed.

November 9 and 10: Conference on education and inter-American cultural relations, to be held at the Mayflower Hotel. The program will soon be announced.

November 29 and 30: Conference on books, libraries, and translations. The program is now in preparation.

The Department is gratified at the attention which these conferences have received, and believes they may make an important contribution to the advancement of peace and friendship among the American nations.

I am, my dear Mr. Vice President,
Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

PETITIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Georgia, endorsing and approving the plan of the Andersonville Memorial Association for the establishment of a memorial garden at Andersonville, Ga., the placing of bronze markers explanatory of the history of Andersonville (site of a Civil War Confederate military prison), and the erection of an heroic monument in stone, dedicated to peace and union—all "to be commensurate with the virtue of the dead who lie buried there and with the im-

portance of the Andersonville story in our national life," which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from Hays H. Lincoln, of Carbondale, Pa., praying for the adoption of a cash-and-carry plan in pending neutrality legislation, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TAFT presented a ballot published by the Cleveland (Ohio) Press asking for an expression of views with respect to proposed amendments to the Neutrality Act, and stated that 3,117 ballots had been received by him as a result of this poll, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WILEY presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

STATE OF WISCONSIN

A joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to protect the domestic fox- and fur-raising industry

Whereas in Wisconsin and in the United States, there has been developed a domestic fox- and fur-raising industry in the last quarter of a century which constitutes a national business amounting to millions of dollars and which employs large numbers of people;

Whereas the fox- and mink-pelt production of this country has been primarily sold to the people of our country in the past with only relatively small foreign imports of fox and mink pelts;

Whereas foreign countries which produce approximately five times the number of fox and mink pelts produced in this country, have to a very large extent, lost their markets on account of the European war;

Whereas foreign countries are now making arrangements to dump this vast world supply of fox and mink pelts onto the United States market which can only reasonably absorb our own production;

Whereas the dumping of this vast quantity of foreign fox and mink pelts onto the United States market will practically ruin the majority of the fox and mink farmers of our country; and

Whereas there is no reason why fox and mink raisers of our country should have their industry destroyed by the dumping of foreign pelts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring). That this legislature strongly urges the President of the United States and the proper Federal agencies to set up a quota on importing fox and mink pelts not to exceed the last 3 years' average of fox and mink pelts shipped into this country; be it further

Resolved. That restrictions be placed on processed fox and mink pelts which would prohibit the flooding of the American market with these products and thus ruin our domestic fur industry; be it further

Resolved. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Tariff Commission, and to all Members of Congress from Wisconsin.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. HAYDEN introduced a bill (S. 2988) for the relief of Bessie Sharrah, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Claims.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEE ON AMERICA'S NEUTRALITY

[Mr. LEE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject America's Neutrality, delivered by him on October 17, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY ON MOBILIZATION FOR PEACE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject Mobilization for Peace, delivered by him on October 17, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. SAM G. BRATTON ON THE NEUTRALITY ISSUE

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the neutrality issue delivered by Hon. Sam G. Bratton before the Kiwanis Convention at Albuquerque, N. Mex., which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM SATURDAY EVENING POST ON NEUTRALITY ISSUE

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Phantasy of a Bloodless Sword," published in the Saturday Evening Post of October 14, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY JOSEPH C. FEHR, ESQ., ON WORK OF MIXED CLAIMS COMMISSION

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Joseph Conrad Fehr, Esq., of the District of Columbia bar, relating to the work of the Mixed Claims Commission, and published in the October issue

of the American Bar Association Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEUTRALITY AND PEACE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306) Neutrality Act of 1939.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, the issue before the Senate is, Shall we do away with the arms-embargo provision of the existing law which makes it unlawful for us to sell arms, ammunition, and implements of war to nations at war? I may say that many people feel that we cannot stop our ships and seamen from going into the war zone without repealing the arms embargo. The arms embargo has nothing at all to do with that. Such a provision can be written into the law without changing the arms embargo. Others say that we should sell material other than arms, ammunition, and implements of war on a cash-and-carry basis. That can be done without changing the arms embargo. It is an entirely separate provision of the joint resolution. I hear others say that Americans should be prohibited from traveling on belligerent vessels; that the joint resolution should prohibit the solicitation of funds for nations in war; that submarines and armed merchantmen should be barred from our ports. All these prohibitions are already in the present law or can be put in it. The passage of the joint resolution now under consideration will have nothing to do with the provisions just mentioned except to continue or put them into force.

This argument reminds me of an incident that could happen to any of us any day. If a man is wearing a raincoat in the rain and decides he also wants an umbrella, it is not necessary for him to take off the raincoat in order to use the umbrella. We can provide all these safeguards for neutrality and at the same time keep the arms embargo, but what we are asked to do is to take off the raincoat as soon as we raise the umbrella. The issue, in plain language, is, Shall the United States of America become a merchant of death? That is the issue.

Now I desire to read a quotation which I think aptly covers the present situation. It is as follows:

At this late date with the wisdom which is so easy after the event, we find it possible to trace the tragic series of small decisions which led Europe into the Great War in 1914 and eventually engulfed us and many other nations. We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war, and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say "no" to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war.

Those are the words of President Roosevelt.

Congress is now in special session to make a decision—not a small one but an important one—one that will determine our future action in the European war of 1939. When we refer to European wars it is necessary to use dates, because they come so often.

The issue is repeal of the arms embargo. The arms embargo was written into law by our Congress in time of peace, long before the start of the present war. It was the result of a long, detailed investigation of the munitions trade by a committee of the United States Senate, the publication of letters and papers of public figures who were active in the period of the war, and the exposure of propaganda. It was written long before the sides had been chosen. It was written when our thoughts were of America and not of Europe. It was written in peace, not in war. The Neutrality Act was not written to assist England, France, or Germany. It was written to protect America.

The American people know the effect of the last war. They know the thousands of boys who never returned, the thousands more who did return crippled, gassed, and destroyed. They know the depression that blighted our economic life, throwing many, many men into the bread lines. They were determined that they should not be involved in another foreign war, and that we should not again send American soldiers to the battlefields of Europe. It was under such conditions that the Neutrality Act was passed.

I feel that by repealing the arms embargo we shall make a mistake. I believe it will be a step directly toward war.

YOUNG AMERICA PAYS OUR MISTAKE

If we make a mistake, we will not pay the penalty—not! The Members of the Senate will not pay the penalty if we

make the mistake of taking the American people into war. No; we are exempt from military service. But if we make a mistake, millions of young men who have no part and no voice in casting this vote will pay the penalty, many the ultimate penalty of death.

What is the reason for repeal of the arms embargo? There are only two reasons, and we all know it: The first reason given by those who want to repeal the arms embargo is that we should help Great Britain and France to defeat Germany. The second reason is that we can make a little profit out of the sale of munitions. Those are the reasons. All other reasons go back to the root of those two things—either men who are interested in the victory of England and France or those who feel that we can make some profit out of the war. Those are the reasons for the repeal of the arms embargo.

Some of you say, "We are not in war. We are not declaring war." No; we have not yet made a declaration of war, but we are edging up to the point where, when an incident occurs, we can make a declaration of war and hope to have the people of the United States feeling that we are again fighting for democracy.

Let me read to you a statement by Woodrow Wilson, made in New York in 1916, and compare it with the letters you are now receiving. This is what President Wilson then said:

I get a great many letters, my fellow citizens, from important and influential men in this country, but I get a great many other letters. I get letters from unknown men, from humble women, from people whose names have never been heard and will never be recorded, and there is but one prayer in all of these letters: "Mr. President, do not allow anybody to persuade you that the people of this country want war with anybody."

Those are the words of President Wilson delivered on the 30th of June 1916, less than 1 year before America declared war on Germany.

Less than 3 months before the declaration of war in 1917, what did President Wilson say to the American people? I quote him:

There will be no war. This country does not intend to become involved in this war. We are the only one of the great white nations that is free from war today, and it would be a crime against civilization for us to go in.

Just before we declared war. Of course, it is easy for us to sit back and say, "There will be no war"; and yet we definitely know that the step we are taking brings us close to the precipice of war. We know that it is definitely a step toward war. Oh, yes; we are getting the people ready for it.

Let me go back to 1914 and read to you a conversation of an American in France, shown in the historical papers of Hanotaux, the French historian. He quotes Mr. Robert Bacon. This is the exact language:

In America * * * there are 50,000 people who understand the necessity of the United States entering the war immediately on your side. But there are 100,000,000 Americans who have not even thought of it. Our task—

Now, listen; this was in 1914—

our task is to see that the figures are reversed, and that the 50,000 become the 100,000,000. We will accomplish this.

Change the 50,000 who want war with the 100,000,000 who do not want war. That process is under way in America today. Do not fool yourselves. Do not be like an ostrich and stick your head in the ground. The war propaganda is at work in America today. Of course, Lord Beaverbrook just came over to gossip, you know. He left England in time of war just to gossip about some Canadian retreat that he had. Oh, yes. You may believe that if you want to, but I do not. Lord Beaverbrook is over here hoping and helping to see that we become interested in the war.

What did Col. Frederick Palmer, the official historian of the World War, say about the propaganda that is loose in America today? I quote him. Certainly Colonel Palmer is not pro-German. I understand he served in the American forces in the last war. This is what he said:

The Allies' propaganda in America has been excellent in this war so far. My recollection of a historian's aching eyes in reading more than 100,000 official documents about the causes of our entry and

our part after our entry singles out many phrases being uttered today which duplicate those of the winter of 1916-17.

ROPING US IN

And so they do. We again hear that we must help the democracies—the same thing they told us in 1915 and 1916—and we hear that we must stop Hitler. In 1916 and 1917 we heard that we must stop the Kaiser. But let me read you from an English journal—not recent, but last year—on getting America into the war. Let me read the words of Hilaire Belloc in *G. K. Chesterton's Weekly* of the 6th day of January 1938. This is what he says:

It is commonly said up and down Europe that we can make the United States do what we like. That idea is based upon the vague and most misleading word "Anglo-Saxon," but also upon the actual and recent experience of the last 20 years. We got the United States into the Great War on our side, and, what was more extraordinary, we managed, in the debt business, to make France the villain of the piece. We have got them to feel with us against the modern Italy, and we have got them to talk of ourselves as a democracy.

This is what Mr. Belloc says:

Can we rope them in to fight, or threaten to fight, the Japanese? It is a question of most poignant interest, and it is a question that will be answered in a comparatively short time one way or the other.

Then he says:

The advantages we have in the working of American opinion and policy are very great, and they have been used in the past with so much success that those who think we shall still win the trick have much to say for themselves. We are the only people of the Old World who use the same printed word, and largely the same spoken word, as the Americans.

How did Sidney Rogerson tell the English people they were going to get us into the war? What did he say? Let me read from his book on how we were going to get into the war. He said:

Fortunately, with America our propaganda is on firm ground.

This was not a man writing to America. It was a man writing in England—not in American books, not in American newspapers, not in American documents—but an Englishman talking to Englishmen; and this is what he said:

Fortunately, with America our propaganda is on firm ground. We can be entirely sincere, as our main plank will be the old democratic one.

Again I hear Senators say, "Oh, we must help England; we must repeal the embargo, because we have to help England save the democracies of the world." Why do they not call England the "British Empire" instead of "England, the democracy"? Oh, no; the word "England" sounds more democratic than "the British Empire."

Let me go ahead with what Sidney Rogerson said about how the English people were going to get us into the war; and when we go into it, remember just what he said they were going to do. This is what he said:

We shall, as before, send our leading literary lights and other men with names well known to the United States to put our point of view over the dinner table.

In other words, "Give them oysters and propaganda at the same time. Fill up their stomachs with food and fill up their brains with English propaganda"; and do not think they are not doing it. Notice these little tête-à-têtes with English statesmen in America today. Oh, no; they are just over here to be nice. They have just come over to make America think they are interested in America.

This is what he said:

We should exploit to the full the views and the experiences of American nationals who might be serving in our forces or those of our Allies. We should make much of them.

This is how they love the American soldier:

We should make much of them, decorate them, single them out for mention in dispatches and the press, and use their stories as propaganda material to their own people.

In other words, have the American soldier come back to the United States decorated, in order to get more American soldiers across the Atlantic Ocean. Of course, we are not declaring war today, but we are going down the path to the

place where it is easy to declare war. We did not declare war in 1914, but we were in war in 1917.

Oh, what are we doing today? We are deserting the fundamental foreign policy of America, which has been our security for peace throughout American history.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HOLT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not wish to anticipate what the Senator will doubtless come to later, but in connection with this prognosis of propaganda to be used in the war, the Senator undoubtedly is familiar with the fact that after we got into the war in 1917, after we had burned our bridges behind us, after some officials of the Government had been informed of the secret treaties, about which we knew nothing before we got in, laying the scenes of the present conflict in Europe, Sir Gilbert Parker, who had been the head of the British propaganda efforts in the United States, wrote an article for Harper's magazine, in which he set out some of the methods of propaganda by which we had been lured into the war; but we were already in then. We were told—and he made no bones whatever in this article—in this article in Harper's magazine—in 1918, I believe it was—of describing some of the methods which had been used in tolling us down the road to war—methods which have been very much more explicitly exposed in well-documented phrases by Prof. H. C. Peterson, of the University of Oklahoma, in his book, *Propaganda for War*, published in the last few months.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Senator from Missouri. Speaking of propaganda, I realize that there is German propaganda in America under the name of the Bund, but it is under its right name, it is a German organization. The trouble with English propaganda is that it is masquerading as Americanism. That is the danger. Look at the Rhodes scholars who are editors of papers, and see where they stand in the matter of helping democracy. Oh, yes; it can be seen right here in the city of Washington.

Let us look at all these unions for propaganda. When a start is made investigating the propaganda of Germany, I will go along, it should be unmasked; but let us take the cloak off these English propagandists who are saying they are old-time settlers of America. There is the danger of the propaganda. The English propaganda is the termite within America that is trying to get us break down our foreign policy. I would rather have an enemy in the open—like the Bund—at which we can strike, and which we should destroy in America, than this English propaganda, which does its work so nicely over the dinner table, and in the newspapers, and at the parties they give to Americans. Which is the worst propaganda in the United States? We all know what is the worst. It is that kind of slick propaganda for which the English have always been famous.

Turning back to the foreign policy of the United States, the two pillars of our foreign policy have been George Washington's Farewell Address and the Monroe Doctrine. George Washington, in his Farewell Address, used these words, and they are sound:

Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications.

George Washington must have been thinking of 1939, because our foreign policy today indicates an enmity and antipathy for one set of nations and certainly love for another set of nations. George Washington predicted the danger which would be the outcome of that. He predicted what would happen. He said we would be involved by slight incidents which might occur. He also made this important statement:

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other.

Does that not look at present-day conditions? Does it not fit perfectly? What else did George Washington say? This is something in which some Senators may be interested, as showing the feeling of some American people:

Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

George Washington told what would happen in 1939. He had foresight. Yet we hear some say, "That is too long ago; that is too far back. The rule of conduct is too old." Rules of conduct were laid down thousands of years ago in the Ten Commandments and in the Golden Rule, and those rules of conduct are just as good today as they were when they were announced.

At election time we do not hear individuals laughing at Washington's Farewell Address. They laugh at it only in the cloakrooms of the United States Senate. That is the place where they laugh; not out before the people.

The second pillar of our foreign policy is the Monroe Doctrine. I know some think the Monroe Doctrine is only a one-sided affair. They think the Monroe Doctrine applies only to foreign nations keeping out of the Western Hemisphere. But what is the Monroe Doctrine? It is not only our protection in the Western Hemisphere. Let me read from it:

Our policy in regard to Europe remains the same, which is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us, to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve these relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy, meeting in all instances the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none. In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparations for our defense.

John Adams said what would happen to the American people, and in a letter to Secretary Livingston he made this statement:

America has been long enough involved in the wars of Europe. She has been a football between the contending nations from the beginning, and it is easy to foresee that France and England both will endeavor to involve us in their future wars. It is our interest and duty to avoid them as much as possible and be completely independent and to have nothing to do with either of them but in commerce.

He knew more about the events of 1939 than some Senators who are alive in 1939.

Let me read what Thomas Jefferson said:

But for us to attempt by war to reform all Europe and bring them back to principles of morality and a respect for the equal rights of nations would show us to be only maniacs of another character.

Our foreign policy has been based on the sound principle of being friendly to all nations, of maintaining friendly relations, until the present administration. Then we find a changed policy on the part of the President of the United States. When the President went to the people in 1936, he did not tell them that he had an interest for England and France and wanted to destroy Germany. At Chataqua, N. Y., he rose and said:

I hate war. I hate war.

That was his campaign cry of 1936. He wanted us to stay on this side of the Atlantic then. But by 1937, when he got the mandate—the mandate about which we have heard so much—the foreign policy seemed to have been changed, at least publicly.

QUARANTINE AGGRESSORS

He went to Chicago to dedicate a bridge, and there he told us that our foreign policy should be "to quarantine the aggressor nations." "To quarantine the aggressor nations!" Not to stay out of the embroilments and entanglements of Europe, but to get in and "quarantine" the aggressor nations.

Mr. President, how are we going to quarantine them unless we send American boys to do the quarantining? Oh, it is said, "We can do otherwise." But history has shown that whenever it is undertaken to quarantine any nation, the soldiers are the ones who have to do the quarantining.

So in 1937 we find that the foreign policy has changed; and then in January of this year the President delivered a speech which most of us heard. From it the Senate can see the background of why we are asked to repeal the arms embargo. This is what he said:

Obviously they must proceed along practical, peaceful lines. But the mere fact that we rightly decline to intervene with arms to prevent acts of aggression does not mean that we must act as if there were no aggression at all. Words may be futile, but war is not the only means of commanding a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. There are many methods short of war, but stronger and more effective than mere words, of bringing home to aggressor governments the aggregate sentiments of our own people.

Let me repeat the last sentence of the President's statement, and see if Senators can find what is at the root of the desire for repeal of the arms embargo:

Wars may be futile, but war is not the only means of commanding a decent respect for the opinion of mankind. There are many methods short of war—

Not in it, but just short of it; right to the precipice of it—

There are many methods short of war but stronger and more effective than mere words of bringing home to aggressor nations the aggregate sentiments of our own people.

That was the statement made by our President in January of this year. In other words, go to the place just short of war; right to the place where we might skid into the war.

ENDORSES INTERVENTION EDITORIAL

Now, let me show the Senate another instance of the President's foreign policy. The Washington Post is edited by a Rhodes scholar and is, of course, very much interested in "democracy" in America on that account, as well as in the preservation of "democracy" across the sea. The Post editor wrote an editorial about the foreign policy, called "The Collective Pronoun." Here is what it said:

"I'll be back in the fall if we don't have a war"—

I do not have to tell the Senator who said that—

These words, spoken by President Roosevelt to the group assembled at Warm Springs to see him off for Washington, were seemingly wholly unpremeditated. Actually it is proper to surmise that serious consideration preceded their utterance. None knows better than the President that his office makes his most casual public observation subject to interpretation as a matter of national policy. And no President was ever more skillful than Mr. Roosevelt in making the most of every opportunity to give a positive direction to public thinking on important issues.

Then it goes on to say:

Most Americans realize today that the sweep of events has now brought Europe to the very verge of war. What is insufficiently realized is the tremendous implications of the impending catastrophe for every citizen of this country. In spite of the best-informed warnings to the contrary, many still believe that another World War might leave the United States relatively undisturbed. In spite of the virtual certainty of American involvement—

Get that, Senators.

In spite of the virtual certainty of American involvement—

Yes; in the name of peace, Mr. President—

In spite of the virtual certainty of American involvement, there are many who would seek to achieve isolation by panicky legislation or to seek shelter behind other paper guaranties of immunity.

To those who would protect themselves by closing their eyes the President addressed his warning. Spoken to a little group in Georgia, it is equally applicable to Americans everywhere. "If we

don't have a war," Mr. Roosevelt will revisit Warm Springs at Thanksgiving. But all personal plans, all future projects are subordinate to that "if." The same, in one degree or another, holds true for all of us.

There is speculation as to what the President meant by "we."

We were going to have a war; remember that.

Did he mean if the United States is itself engaged in hostilities, or merely if a major conflict is raging overseas? Those who have followed Mr. Roosevelt's thoughtful speeches on the conditions necessary for peace will understand his choice of a pronoun. By "we" he undoubtedly meant western civilization.

Are we not a part of the western civilization?

By "we" he undoubtedly meant western civilization.

In his statement, "I'll be back if we don't have a war," he linked "we" up with western civilization. "We'll be in it." I proceed with the editorial:

A war affecting its foundations would immediately affect us vitally, whether or not the United States was at the outset physically involved.

Let me repeat that. Here is the editorial which President Roosevelt endorsed as his foreign policy. First, that we could not keep out, and that we—western civilization—were going to have a war. But let me read this sentence:

A war affecting its foundations would immediately affect us vitally, whether or not the United States was at the outset physically involved.

Get that.

Whether the United States was at the outset physically involved.

In other words, we are going to get in the front door before we get hit. This is the editorial which when he read the President said he nearly fell out of bed, because it was so close to his viewpoint of foreign policy. We are going to have a war. And who are "we"? Western civilization. We are going to have a war "whether or not the United States was at the outset physically involved."

The editorial proceeds:

But there was a greater value than its stimulus to national thinking in the President's passing remark on Easter afternoon. Until it has actually started another world war is not inevitable. It can still be averted if the free nations are willing to show that they will take a stand before it is too late.

Who is to determine which are the free nations? When did the United States become the censor for the entire world?

Pressure from the Berlin-Rome axis will not ease until it reaches the point of serious resistance. Then only can a different and honestly conciliatory attitude be expected from the dictators. Nothing less than the show of preponderant force will stop them, for force is the only language which they understand.

Who is going to have a war? We are going to have a war. Who are we going to stop? The dictators. We are going to stop them by force. And who is to apply that force? We, with American soldiers?

Mr. President, no one can read that editorial without realizing that when the President said that was his notion of foreign relations he meant that we were going to go in and stop the dictators by force, if necessary. And who did he mean by "we"? By "we" he said he meant western civilization.

Senators, I am quoting the President; he endorsed the editorial. Well, here is what the newspaper said the next day, and I want to read it. It is from the Washington Post of April 12, 1939. The heading is:

PRESIDENT ENDORSES POST EDITORIAL ON FOREIGN POLICY—GOOD, CLEAR, HONEST, HE TELLS NEWSMEN: HIS "IF WE DON'T HAVE WAR" TALK AN EFFORT TO PRESERVE PEACE BY PREPONDERANCE OF POWER

President Roosevelt stamped with his hearty approval yesterday a newspaper editorial calling for a "preponderant show of force" by democratic nations to halt the dictators and prevent war.

The editorial, appearing yesterday morning in the Washington Post (independent)—

Get that—independent. Yes; "the editorial appearing yesterday morning in the Washington Post (independent)." Oh, no; there is no politics in war. Do not be fooled about that—

The editorial, appearing yesterday morning in the Washington Post (independent), said that the world war "can still be averted if the free nations are willing to show that they will take a stand before it is too late."

The President ordered the editorial inserted in the minutes of his press conference, saying it was very good, very clear, and very honest. He said it had not been inspired by him, but that he had almost fallen out of bed when he read it yesterday morning.

So that is our foreign policy—that we, by force, should stop the dictators, and should go to war to do so. Who are “we”? Western civilization, meaning also the United States of America. The President said, “I think so much of this editorial that I want it put in the minutes of my press conference because it is so good, so clear, and so honest. When I read it I nearly fell out of bed.” Mr. President, that is the President’s policy.

Then we talk about neutrality. This is not neutrality. It never was meant to be neutrality. We all know the difference. If the American people had a microphone in the cloakrooms of the United States Senate, they would learn a great deal about what is going on in Washington because we in the cloakrooms knew that repeal of the embargo was not for the purpose of neutrality but to help England and France. We all knew that.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon, and then I wish to put the remainder of the editorial in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLMAN. I will wait until the Senator has completed the reading of his editorial.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, this is not mine. Do not hold me responsible for it. I had nothing to do with it. I do not believe in it. I do not believe it is our duty to set ourselves up as the judge of the world’s conduct. It is nice for a man sitting in Washington to say that we should stop war by force, but the collective pronoun “we” does not mean “us.” It means the boys between 20 and 35. Those are the ones it means.

Let me now proceed with the editorial:

HIS VIEWS FOR POSTERITY

He added he wanted it inserted in the press conference minutes so that posterity might see what his views had been.

He was not satisfied to tell the Post that he thought the editorial was good, but he was going to put it in his minutes, and then put it in that building up in Hyde Park for posterity, so that his views on foreign policies might be known.

Then the article continues at length. It quotes from the editorial I have previously read. Mr. President, it is not necessary to read it at this time. In order that posterity may know the President’s position on foreign affairs, I ask unanimous consent that this article be put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for embalming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and the article may be printed in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington Post of April 12, 1939]

PRESIDENT ENDORSES POST EDITORIAL ON FOREIGN POLICY—GOOD, CLEAR, HONEST, HE TELLS NEWSMEN; HIS “IF WE DON’T HAVE WAR” TALK AN EFFORT TO PRESERVE PEACE BY PREPONDERANCE OF POWER

President Roosevelt stamped with his hearty approval yesterday a newspaper editorial calling for a “preponderant show of force” by democratic nations to halt the dictators and prevent war.

The editorial, appearing yesterday morning in the Washington Post (independent), said that world war “can still be averted if the free nations are willing to show that they will take a stand before it is too late.”

The President ordered the editorial inserted in the minutes of his press conference, saying it was very good, very clear, and very honest. He said it had not been inspired by him but that he had almost fallen out of bed when he read it yesterday morning.

HIS VIEWS FOR POSTERITY

He added he wanted it inserted in the press conference minutes so that posterity might see what his views had been.

While the President spoke news dispatches from London were saying that Prime Minister Chamberlain was pursuing an appeasement policy toward Mussolini, having decided to give him “one more chance” to keep the peace. Whether the President knew of this British decision when he pointed to the Post editorial, and whether his words would tend to strengthen the British attitude toward the dictators remained undetermined.

The Post editorial was based on Mr. Roosevelt’s remark as he left Warm Springs, Ga., recently:

“I’ll be back in the fall if we don’t have a war.”

LXXXV—35

It said this was no casual utterance. “Most Americans realize today that the sweep of events has now brought Europe to the very verge of war,” it commented. “What is insufficiently realized is the tremendous implications of the impending catastrophe for every citizen of this country.”

“In spite of the best-informed warnings to the contrary many still believe that another World War might leave the United States relatively undisturbed. In spite of the virtual certainty of American involvement, there are many who would seek to achieve isolation by panicky legislation or to seek shelter behind other paper guarantees of immunity.”

To these persons the editorial said the President had addressed his warning. His use of the word “we,” said the editorial, undoubtedly meant western civilization.

“A war affecting its foundations would immediately affect us vitally, whether or not the United States was at the outset physically involved,” it added.

Speaking of the way to avert war, the editorial asserted:

“Pressure from the Berlin-Rome axis will not ease until it reaches the point of serious resistance. Then only can a different and honestly conciliatory attitude be expected from the dictators. Nothing less than the show of preponderant force will stop them, for force is the only language which they understand. But, like less exalted bullies, force is to them a real deterrent.”

By using the word “we,” the editorial said, “the President told Hitler and Mussolini, far more impressively than he told Warm Springs, that the tremendous force of the United States must be a factor in their current thinking. He told the axis powers that the administration is far from indifferent to their plottings. He made it plain that a war forced by them would from the outset involve the destinies of a nation which, as they fully realize, is potentially far stronger than Germany and Italy united.”

To make that plain at this crucial time, the editorial pointed out, is to help in preventing war. “To make the dictators realize that there is a limit to unresisted aggression is in itself to set that limit. It is on that incontrovertible reasoning that the French have stiffened their policy. It is on that reasoning that the British are laying down a dead line. It is on that reasoning, through the application of which peace can still be saved, that President Roosevelt properly links the United States with the eleventh-hour effort to avert a shattering disaster.”

The President had previously refused at his press conference to comment on the European situation. His only remarks on foreign affairs were confined to approving the project announced Monday by Senator BYRNES (Democrat), of South Carolina, for exchanging American surplus cotton and wheat for strategic war materials of other countries.

When a correspondent insisted on inquiring whether the Chief Executive had absolutely nothing to say on the foreign situation, Mr. Roosevelt promptly made the editorial his own opinion.

Mr. HOLT. I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the generosity of the Senator in yielding to me in order that I may make an observation prompted by the logic of his remarks.

Presumably it is proposed to amend the present Neutrality Act so that this Nation may assist England and France in the present European war.

Recently the fact has come to light that Germany is introducing a new technique in naval warfare, with some rather startling results in the sinking of the great British airplane carrier *Courageous* and the superdreadnaught *Royal Oak* and damage to other battleships of presumably first magnitude. Should the new German technique of airplane and submarine warfare prove successful and the mastery of the seas thereby be transferred from England to Germany, would those who now advocate a change in the present Neutrality Act so that whoever controls the seas may come to our shores to get arms and munitions to carry on the war then and in that event advocate a change in the Neutrality Act so as to prevent Germany from obtaining arms, ammunition, and implements of war with which to slaughter the people of England and France? In other words, I propound the question: Should the American policy blow hot and cold as the ebb and flow of battle goes on in Europe?

Mr. HOLT. Answering the Senator from Oregon, I say that those who want to repeal the arms embargo to help England and France would then want us to stay in continuous session so as to watch the battle front every hour and change the arms embargo, depending upon the outcome of the war; in other words, to blow hot and cold. It is necessary to put in an intermediate stage—to blow medium. [Laughter.] We do not blow hot and cold. We blow hot, then medium, then cold. We have to prepare the people for it.

Talk about changing the embargo. The only reason in the world why we are in session—and there is no need of trying to fool the people—is to help England and France defeat

Germany in the war under the name of neutrality. Talk about changing, blowing hot and blowing cold. Mr. President, have you ever noticed how the administration blows hot and cold about communism? Communism now has its whiskers back on.

It is a terrible thing because it is now against England. But when England was supposedly planning a trade agreement with Russia there was no word from the administration about communistic Russia. Oh, no. We are now preparing to get rid of all the Communists in the Government. A few months ago the administration denied that there were any Communists in the Government. In other words, the blowing hot and cold depends upon the draft from Downing Street, not from Main Street. It is not the winds of the Atlantic Ocean which bother us. It is the piped circuit from Downing Street.

I will say to the Senator from Oregon that if very many more *Royal Oaks* are sunk we shall be constantly in session.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator is undoubtedly familiar with the fact that occasionally we have conflicting breezes from Downing Street on the same day. For example, one day last week we had the announcement that Great Britain had just that day consummated a trade agreement with Mr. Stalin and Communist Russia, and on the very same day the speech of Prime Minister Chamberlain was made in the House of Commons in which he stated that it would be a stultification and dishonor to Great Britain to make peace with Germany, because she had invaded Poland.

I myself am unable to understand—perhaps the Senator can explain—why it would be a stultification of British honor to make peace with Germany, because she invaded Poland, while at the same time making a reciprocal-trade agreement with Russia, which had also invaded Poland and gotten away with a little more than half the "swag."

Mr. HOLT. British honor is based on British imperialism. Britain has no more use for its honor, except as it protects its colonies and the financial interest of England, than Hitler has for Nazi honor. We cannot believe either of them. I intend to discuss that point a little later.

CONFERENCE OF AMBASSADORS

With respect to this administration being neutral, let me read from Raymond Moley. Many Senators used to know him pretty well. He wrote a book called *After Seven Years*.

I am quoting Raymond Moley, because I was not called into the conference. Do not be fooled about that. Mr. Moley said:

After Munich, Roosevelt at once summoned home our ambassador to Berlin. There were consultations with Ambassadors Phillips, Kennedy, and Bullitt. The consensus seems to have been agreement that the time had come to do "something practical," to stop Germany, Italy, and Japan, and to assist England and France. That "something" was to be a revision of the Neutrality Act to permit France and England to buy guns and munitions in this country.

This book was written at the time the discussion was going on. I continue:

And the reason for that frankly and designedly unneutral step, it presently appeared, was no longer the "lawlessness" of the axis powers so much as it was the belief that only by throwing our weight on the side of England and France could we protect our own interests.

Behind the scenes, the President called in the ambassadors; and in order to find something practical to stop Germany, he took steps on one side of this conflict in the name of neutrality.

Mr. Moley continues:

Ambassadors Bullitt and Kennedy then went off to Florida. When they had spent some weeks there it was suddenly discovered that they were in possession of burning secrets which must be communicated to the House and Senate Military Affairs Committees.

Perhaps one of those submarines was down in Florida. I do not know. Submarines have been seen all over the country. An investigation of submarines was made out west, and it was found that they were not submarines at all, but only

snapping turtles sticking their heads out of the water looking for air. [Laughter.]

Mr. Moley continues, after telling about Ambassadors Bullitt and Kennedy going down to Florida:

When they had spent some weeks there it was suddenly discovered that they were in possession of burning secrets which must be communicated to the House and Senate Military Affairs Committees. There followed a magnificently publicized dash back to Washington, intended to convey the idea that a world calamity was in the offing, and, on January 10, 1939, the imparting of information presumably so sensational that it could not be made public.

Continuing with Mr. Moley:

Observers recognize in these dramatic maneuverings signs of a State Department campaign to "educate" the American public to the need for a stronger foreign policy.

I am sure no one would say that Mr. Ernest Lindley is antagonistic to the President. Certainly nobody could say that. This is what he said in one of his columns:

It must be recorded that there are men in the Roosevelt administration who think that this is our war, and, so believing, can be expected to urge that we give Great Britain and her allies whatever help may be necessary to bring them a victory.

Have we not heard on this floor the contention that this is our war?

On the other side of the Capitol, when the question of the neutrality joint resolution was under consideration this spring, the Secretary of State and the representatives of the State Department were asked many questions. In the minority report of the committee on the other side of the Capitol the question was asked, "Why should we repeal the arms embargo?" This is what was said:

When representatives of the State Department were asked whether there was any change in the international situation which would cause Congress to repeal the provision for an arms embargo at this time, our committee was told that Hitler's taking over of 27 munitions plants in Austria, and the Skoda works and 11 other plants in Czechoslovakia, justified the change.

In the name of neutrality? No; because Hitler had gotten some munition factories. Therefore, the United States should become the arsenal for England and France. I was not present, but this is from the report of the minority of the Foreign Affairs Committee on the other side of the Capitol.

WHY THE SECRECY?

Why is all this hush-hush secrecy if we are not on the way to the precipice of war? Why should the American people not know the facts? Why should reports of committees not be revealed to the American people? Let any Senator try to get from the War Department the report on its mobilization plans; let him see if he can get even a photostatic copy of it. The only one, I understand, who has a copy is a newspaperman. If we are not on the way to war, why should not the American people know the facts? The President said the other day, when he referred to a submarine being off the coast of Florida, "I am going to tell the American people all the facts about it." If he wants to tell them all the facts, why does he not tell the American people about the mobilization of industry as planned by the administration? In the administration we have internationalists who will give the people of Europe democracy if they have to kill them to do it. Oh, yes; we have internationalists right here who are interested in protecting democracy.

Now, let us look at the democracy we want protected and which in 1917 we protected after 100,000 American boys were killed. What State Department officials were in the front-line trenches at that time? They were fighting for democracy 3,000 miles from the front-line trenches. Let us consider the secret treaties to which my friend from Missouri referred. I quote this reference from *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*:

Grey thought that France would insist upon Alsace Lorraine. The French believe the Allies will win and that they can impose the terms of peace upon Germany; later, perhaps, they would find that to impose peace conditions upon Germany would necessitate continuing the war for a number of years, and when that was realized they might be willing to make concessions.

He did not know the mind of Russia, but he believed by giving them Constantinople and the Straits they would be willing to acquiesce in almost any other terms that might be agreed upon.

The American boy who was in France was not told about the secret treaties; he was not told about the diplomacy of Europe. He died thinking he was fighting for the democracy of England and France and the other Allies.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think the Senator is mistaken as to the purpose of that war. The avowed purpose of it was to engage in a "war to end war," "to make the world safe for democracy." I think that the experience of today shows how hollow those slogans were, but that was the avowed purpose of our engaging in the last war, namely, to engage in a "war to end war" and "to make the world safe for democracy."

Mr. HOLT. The Senator from Missouri is correct. That is what the boys were told. It will not be long until the slogan in America will be "Stop Hitler; let us make the world safe for democracy so we will have no more mobilizations and end all war." Does that compare favorably with the statement of Daladier, that "we must crush Hitler so that we will not have to mobilize every 6 months." A war to end all wars. No; it was not a war to end all wars; it was a war that provoked the present war. Go back to the causes of the war of 1939, and we find them in the Versailles Treaty. That is a cause of the World War of 1939. This war is only another one of the ever-recurring wars in Europe.

Let me quote what Mr. Baker said about the secret treaties:

In America we knew little and cared less about these European secret treaties. Our national interests were at no point affected by them. * * * Everyone knew, indeed, that Italy had driven a hard bargain when she came into the war on the side of the Allies. But this was war, and in war anything may be necessary. * * * Even the State Department of the United States, which is the organization especially charged with the duty of knowing about foreign affairs, seems to have had no interest in these secret treaties, and if Secretary Lansing is to be believed, little or no knowledge of them. * * * While the President must have known in general of these secret agreements, for he often excoriated the practice of "secret diplomacy," he apparently made no attempt to secure any vital or comprehensive knowledge.

Then he says further:

When Mr. Balfour came to Washington as the British commissioner in 1917 he explained certain of these treaties to Colonel House. Colonel House, however, said he was not particularly interested, because it seemed to him more important to bend all energies to the winning of the war.

Oh, no; it was not necessary to pay any attention to those secret treaties—those treaties that lined up the powers of Europe in the war of 1917; those treaties under which, long before the war, the nations parties thereto said, "We will take a part of this country and you take a part of the other country." The Senate may take my word that 20 years from now it will be found that there have been and are now more secret treaties in Europe; and yet we are sticking our nose into Europe in order to "save the world for democracy" and favoring a "war to end all war." That is the No. 2 war to end all wars.

And what does Ambassador Page say? Did Great Britain go to war in Europe in 1914 because of the violation of Belgium's neutrality? Let me quote what Ambassador Page said:

Page admitted that the British would have been found fighting with France even if France had violated Belgium.

Let Senators appreciate the force of that statement:

The British would have been found fighting with France even if France had violated Belgium.

We were then told about "poor, bleeding Belgium," and in 1939 we are told about "poor, bleeding Poland." Ah, at the expense and cost of the lives of American boys?

Do you think, Mr. President, they were fighting for honor and for democracy over there? George Bernard Shaw expressed what the world knows to be true about England. Here is what he said:

If our own military success were at stake, we would violate the neutrality of heaven itself.

Note that, Senators. If British military success were at stake at the counter, the neutrality of heaven itself would be violated.

ENGLAND'S TERRITORIAL GAINS

Lloyd George said that England did not seek "one yard of territory."

Does not that sound like Chamberlain? I will tell you what England got out of the World War and why England was fighting for democracy. England got 994,950 square miles of territory, 25 times the size of Czechoslovakia, 6 times the size of Poland, and that in a war for democracy. England was fighting to crush Kaiserism in 1914-17, and in the meantime she picked up almost a million square miles of territory where she could promote democracy.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. After crushing Kaiserism, the British King is now sending birthday greetings and congratulations to the German ex-Kaiser at Doorn. It is all right now, after they got a million square miles of territory.

Mr. HOLT. Oh, yes, Mr. President; but that was a family quarrel. There was "Cousin Nicky" of Russia and "Cousin Willie" of Germany and "Cousin George" of England, all of the same line of Queen Victoria. I repeat, it was a family fight in 1914-17. England, a great democracy, the British Empire, a great democracy that we have to take a chance of getting into war to save.

Let me give some figures. England has 50,328 square miles of territory; but how much territory does she control? England, with 50,000 square miles of territory, controls 13,253,240 square miles of territory in order to promote democracy in India.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. HOLT. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. That is about four and a half times as large as the United States, is it not?

Mr. HOLT. I cannot say, offhand, as to that.

Mr. LUNDEEN. It is approximately so. We have a little over 3,000,000 square miles, have we not?

Mr. HOLT. That is correct.

Mr. LUNDEEN. And the 13,000,000, whatever the figure was—

Mr. HOLT. Thirteen million two hundred and fifty-three thousand two hundred and forty square miles.

Mr. LUNDEEN. The bleeding British Empire, this empire with nearly 600,000,000 people, this empire whose sword has been dripping with the blood of enslaved and oppressed peoples for a thousand years, has territory four and a half times the size of the United States. Britain, I say, does not come into this war with clean hands.

Mr. HOLT. Yes. Here is England, with 37,354,917 population, controlling 494,870,104 individuals in the name of democracy; and then we are to get close to war, where we may be shoved in, in order to save democracy by saving England.

What about France? France herself has 212,659 square miles of territory, but the French Empire is not in France alone. It has 4,613,315 square miles of territory—an empire that went out with sword in order to make the world safe for democracy throughout the centuries.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. The French Empire is more than a million square miles larger than the United States, is it not?

Mr. HOLT. That is correct. Furthermore, the democracy they gave to Syria! Oh, was not that democracy? I intend to discuss that subject a little later on, but here is a group of individuals wanting to make the world safe for democracy by making it safe for England and France.

VERSAILLES TREATY

What is the cause of the trouble in Europe today? It goes back to the Versailles Treaty, when those men who deserted

honor, forgot ideals, sat down to carve up Europe to their own fancy.

What did Signor Nitti say about the Versailles Treaty? He said:

This cursing of the guilty people has no parallel in modern history. We must go back to the early ages of mankind to find anything of the kind.

That is what the Italian historian said.

Furthermore, let me read what H. G. Wells said about it. He said:

Germany, exhausted and beaten, surrendered in 1918, upon the strength of these promises and upon the similar promises in President Wilson's 14 Points, but the Conference at Versailles treated promises as "scraps of paper." The peace imposed on the new Germany was a punitive peace.

It is now said that Hitler treats treaties as scraps of paper. Of course they are; but how were treaties treated in the Versailles conference? What happened? Not since Rome punished Carthage was there such a treaty placed on any people as the Allies placed upon the German Empire in order to destroy it. Hitler was caused by the Versailles Treaty. He was the boil on the body politic of Germany, caused by the bad blood that came as the result of the poisoning of 1917. You may cut out the boil, but the blood is still infected.

No; Hitler is just a symbol. He is the man in the way of the control of Europe by Great Britain.

Let us see what the magazine Time says by way of tracing the conditions in Germany which caused the present condition in 1939. This is what it says:

Defeated, exhausted, blockaded, Germany passed through a staggering cycle of panics, revolutionary and counterrevolutionary outbreaks, financial debacles, governmental upheavals. Her army was disarmed, her fleet scuttled, her merchant marine forfeited, but 62,000,000 Germans nevertheless remained to be fed, clothed, housed, organized in some political community. Europe's new states outside Germany emerged slowly, bumped shoulders, clashed over boundaries, made alliances. But Germany remained Europe's central problem, while Russia was still split with civil war. For the first 5 years of peace, from the armistice to the Ruhr, the biggest development in Europe, outside of Russia, was France's policy of keeping Germany weak.

Weak, Germany certainly was. At the war's end, after the Versailles Treaty, she had lost:

One million and seven hundred thousand killed in battle, 4,200,000 wounded, 1,150,000 missing.

Alsace-Lorraine, most of Posen, and West Prussia, all her colonies, other territorial concessions.

Eighteen million of her population, over 1,000,000 square miles of her territory, 45 percent of her coal, 65 percent of her iron ore, 15 percent of her arable lands, 10 percent of her factories, 5,100,000 tons of her merchant fleet.

To France she agreed to deliver 105,000 tons of benzol, 150,000 tons of coal tar, 90,000 tons of sulfate of ammonia, 500 stallions, 30,000 mares, 2,000 bulls, 90,000 cows, 1,000 rams, 100,000 sheep, 10,000 goats, and she agreed to pay (but paid only in part) \$5,000,000,000 reparations before May 1921.

But 62,000,000 Germans weakened to desperation seemed as menacing to the rest of the world as to France in her post-war mood they seemed reassuring. Inside Germany political chaos became almost normal, marked by Communist and reactionary uprisings.

Further, it says:

Outside Germany the states created by the Treaty of Versailles and the treaties which followed it were linked to France in a chain of alliances. Poland and France in the treaty of February 19, 1921, pledged themselves to mutual assistance in the event of German aggression. When Belgium and Czechoslovakia also signed with France, the ring around Germany was closed. When Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania formed another such ring around Hungary—and this ring was coordinated with the other by the Franco-Czechoslovakian alliance—French security against possible German ambitions seemed as solid as diplomatic measures, military might, economic dominance could make it.

Also, it tells us:

And when Poincaré, on January 11, 1923, sent French troops to seize 80 percent of Germany's coal, iron, and steel sources, in "the mad and ruinous Ruhr episode," Great Britain's criticism swelled, Great Britain's sympathies shifted. Lloyd George, who 4 years before had been reelected on a platform of punishment for Germany, later called it "the dismal and tragic episode of the Ruhr occupation," and said that it caused "untold misery to many millions of Central Europe, had put back the clock of post-war reconstruction throughout the world, intensified unemployment problems and industrial depression, and had signally failed in its main object of extracting reparations from Germany."

For 600 of the maddest days in history French troops patrolled the Ruhr; 147,000 German citizens were driven from the district in 11 months.

Burgomasters of every major city in the land of 4,000,000 people were expelled or imprisoned.

Funds and records of manufacturing companies were seized and their offices taken over; at least 100 people lost their lives, newspapers were suppressed, 19,000 officials in the area of the French-sponsored "Autonomous Government of the Palatinate" were deported.

In Munich, Ludendorff and Hitler attempted to set up a dictatorship. German workers in the Ruhr downed their tools, supported by the German Government, which printed more paper currency to pay them.

Germany's economy was swept away in an avalanche which threatened to break the ring around her, sweep over Europe. In December, shortly before the French occupied the Ruhr, a United States dollar would buy 7,000 marks. In a month it would buy 50,000. By June it would buy 100,000. Prices were quoted by the hour, workmen paid by the day, savings wiped out, housewives rushed to spend money before nightfall, knowing morning would make it worth less. In August one United States dollar would buy 5,000,000 marks. By the middle of November the United States dollar was quoted at 2,500,000,000,000 in Berlin, and 4,000,000,000,000 at Cologne 300 miles away.

Oh, yes; this was the kind of peace that was imposed on a people destroyed, starved to death, and the natural result would be Hitler. The natural result would be nazi-ism. It rises out of the ruins and desolation of such a punitive peace as that.

May I quote what the Manchester Guardian, an English paper, said about the treatment of Germany?

The root factor in the situation is that the German masses are exhausted and starving. You have only to see the children in the German slums, all head and no body, with thin necks and gray, ghastly skins, to realize what a magnificent weapon a blockade is. In Berlin there are scores of thousands of children who have never tasted milk.

That was the peace of the democracies—the democracies we are expected to go over and fight for.

We all realize that Hitler came out of the crushing of Germany. Hitler was the result of the terrible persecution not by the Nazis but by England and France in the occupation and destruction of Germany, so that Germany would never rise and bother them as a foreign power. We realize that out of that came Hitler; and when Hitler was rising to power who armed him? Who armed Hitler? We find that part of the arming of Hitler was done in France and in England. Hitler got his first arms from the countries which are now seeking to destroy him.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think the statement the Senator has made is absolutely accurate; but I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the United States of America can by no means claim lack of guilt in arming Hitler. I may say to the Senator that during the munitions investigation it was accidentally discovered that the United States had been permitting the sale to Mr. Hitler, or to Hitler Germany, of certain very essential airplane parts, and that when it was proposed to develop that matter the Secretary of Commerce of the United States came before the Munitions Committee in executive session and urged that we not disclose it, and stated that he had given the information to us in a confidential way, so that only a portion of it actually got into the record of the Munitions Committee hearings.

Mr. HOLT. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri if it is not true that pressure was also brought to bear on the committee not to make public the part that J. Pierpont Morgan had in buying munitions during the war.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is no question about that. I will further say to the Senator that such very great pressure was brought to bear on the Munitions Committee with regard to the secret treaties, in view of the fact that the communications had been sent to us as confidential communications, that the committee never was able to make public the correspondence with regard to the secret treaties

which came to the attention of the State Department very shortly after our entrance into the war.

Subsequently, however, by some process with which I am not familiar, a leading American newspaper service obtained copies of the correspondence with regard to the secret treaties, showing the correspondence between Mr. Balfour—afterward Earl Balfour—and Secretary Lansing, which disclosed clear warning to the United States as to the secret treaties very shortly after we entered the war. How that correspondence was obtained by this news service I am not advised, but I think there is no doubt on the part of anybody who has ever read the correspondence that it was substantially correct.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Senator; and I will say when history is written about our foreign policy in this period we shall find out many things we do not know today. We may find out that Anthony Eden was not over here just to make a speech to the manufacturers' association. We may find out that Lord Beaverbrook was not over here just to gossip. We may find out that the King and Queen were not over here just to look at the grandeur of the American Continent. Oh, the parade that has been going on!

WHO ARMED HITLER?

But going back to the arming of Hitler, let me quote something about the arming of Hitler, and show that the French and British Governments helped arm Hitler. This is an extract from a book on the subject, *Merchants of Death*, by H. C. and F. C. Hanighen—pages 244-245:

The rise of Hitler and the Nazis in Germany was also the signal for the arms makers in other countries to offer their services and wares to a worthy cause. The British, as noted, received an order for 60 of their superior airplanes. * * * M. Sennac charged at the Radical Socialist Congress on October 14, 1933, that Schneider had recently furnished 400 of the latest model tanks to Germany, routing them through Holland in order to avoid suspicion. France is also supplying raw materials for explosives to the Germans. The Dura factory at Couze St. Front, near Bordeaux, is shipping thousands of carloads of cellulose to Germany every year. This factory is mainly under British ownership. Its contract with Germany stipulates that the cellulose must be used for the manufacture of peaceful products, but it is hardly a secret that it is utilized for making explosives. The I. G. Farben Industrie in Germany, which manufactures explosives from this cellulose, is owned, to at least 75 percent, by French capital. These facts are known in France, but nothing is done about them, because the Dura factory is one of France's chief explosive factories in case of war, and because American manufacturers would immediately fill the German orders if the French did not. As for the French control of the German chemical industry, the Government does not insist on the withdrawal of French capital for the simple reason that the British would immediately replace the French.

There is one thing after another showing how England and France, not proclaiming their great antagonism for Hitler, helped arm Hitler in Europe. They knew about the Treaty of Versailles. They created a Frankenstein, which is now bothering them.

ENGLISH ATROCITIES

Some say we should help England and France because of the terrible atrocities Germany is committing and has committed in Poland and has committed in Czechoslovakia. I want my position clear, unmistakably clear. I condemn with all the power that is in me any of the persecution and any of the atrocities of which Germany has been guilty in Czechoslovakia and in Poland. But remember that England's hands are not clean. Let me give a few instances of the atrocities committed by England, the country to defend which we are to get close to war. Here is one from Ireland. The British Empire was so nice to Ireland! I quote from the book, *Ireland's Case*:

O'Donovan Rossa, when in English prisons, serving his life sentence, and protesting against the indignities to which he and his fellows were subject, frequently had his hands chained behind his back for days together, in solitary confinement. And to eat the bits of food that were thrust to him through the bars, he had to go on his knees and lap it up like a wild beast.

Mr. President, that did not occur under the control of Germany; that occurred under the control of Great Britain.

Here is another one:

Michael Davitt, the one-armed man, tells how he and his fellow political prisoners in English dungeons, in order to get a mouthful of the fresh air for which they gasped, had oftentimes to lie on their stomachs on the floor of their cell and put their mouths to the slit at the bottom of the door. And on passing a garbage barrel when the keeper was fortunately not watching them, the prisoners grabbed from it the dirty ends of tallow candles, and secreted the tid-bits, which at the first opportunity they ravenously devoured.

The treatment of Irish political prisoners in English dungeons has been universally so brutal, so savagely unhuman, so much worse than anything the world is aware of, that it is no wonder these Irishmen emerge from the English dungeons—whenever they do emerge—incurably invalidated, crippled, blind, and insane. For some, the jail door opened to the tomb. For others, far worse—it opened to the madhouse.

There is no question of persecution. Persecution is not the sole attribute of Germany. Despicable and despicable as their persecution may be, persecution has been employed by others. Let me give another instance of the lovely attitude of England; let me tell something of their justice in Africa.

On a cross solidly constructed at 15 paces from the gibbet they are preparing the punishment of flagellation. The first sufferer strips to the waist, passes his head in the iron collar, stretches out his arms, which they bind to the cross, and on his bare torso the kurbash descends rhythmically to the sound of the voice that counts the blows and of the cries of pain which each of them wrings from the sufferer; the bronze skin tumefies, splits in places, the blood spurts; it is sickening, horrible. The explanation finished, with great effort the fellow can stand upright.

A second man succeeds him, who cries out still more desperately; the third one is literally contorted under the lash; he loses consciousness, the doctor stops the flogging. Meanwhile the man hanged has given up the ghost. The small cord turns on its pulley and is fastened to the buckle of the leathern waist belt of the victim who is hauled up to take off the slip knot; they untie the feet and hands, and, on a litter brought by the assistants, they lay out the corpse to take it away to a tent provided with winding sheets and coffins.

BOMBING OF DAMASCUS

Mr. President, that was English democracy. And France does not have clean hands when it comes to the question of persecuting people. Let me read about the action of France in Syria, not a hundred years ago, but less than 15 years ago. I quote from the *Literary Digest* of 1925:

The screaming and bursting shells that spattered the streets of Damascus with the blood of innocent men; women, and children sent a thrill of horror throughout the civilized world—a horror not lessened by the fact that the shells were fired from the guns of a Christian nation. And the work of the artillery was supplemented by bombing airplanes and by tanks that spit machine-gun fire as they lumbered through the historic streets of what is said to be the world's oldest inhabited city.

When there is talk about Germans bombing the other countries, let us go to Damascus and look at the graves of the Syrians who were killed by the bombs of France. The article in the *Literary Digest* proceeds:

This exhibition of "frightfulness" began on Sunday night, October 18—2 days after the initialing of the European security pacts at Locarno—and continued until late Tuesday afternoon. An eyewitness quoted in an Associated Press dispatch describes the period of the bombardment as one of "unforgettable horror," tells of hundreds of dead bodies lying in the streets, and estimates that "at least 2,000 were buried in the debris of the wrecked buildings of Damascus."

That was not in Warsaw; it was in Damascus. Who was stationed there? General Gamelin, now the head of the French forces on the western front, was stationed there, according to Time.

In the name of democracy, in the name of civilization, in the name of Christianity, these things happened.

Now let us go back and see how lovely England has treated her subjects. Let me read about some of the instances of England's wonderful treatment of the people. I am giving actual quotations:

ATROCITIES BY THE BRITISH SOLDIERS IN THE BOER WAR

An officer in the field (December, 1900): "It was sufficient that arms were discovered; firewood was at once collected; the wife and little children, bedridden old men and women were ordered out without a moment's respite, and the homestead burned before their eyes. It was midwinter, and the nights were indescribably cold, and in these thinly populated districts there were often no neighbors to

give shelter. It was murder as cold-blooded and deliberate as if they had been placed against a wall and shot; worse, indeed, because their sufferings would have been sooner over." (Walsh.)

That was English democracy. Here is another, quoting an English soldier:

"Later on houses were burned on all sorts of pretexts, until farm burning became the daily business of soldiers." A lieutenant testifies (Ottawa Citizen, Jan. 7, 1901) that, "We moved on from valley burning, looting, and turning out the women and children to sit and cry beside the ruins of their once beautiful farmsteads. * * * We burned a track 6 miles wide through these fertile valleys and completely destroyed the village of Wilport."

Morning Leader, June 11, extract from a letter " * * * but it was grand sport chasing young cockerels and chopping geese's heads off, hearing pianos play as they rolled upside down into a fire lit in the middle of the room, piling pictures and brackets, etc., on a deal table and then putting a straw mattress underneath to start the blaze."

War gods are not heroes, but frequently incendiaries. Here is a part of an order in the Boer War: "Unless the men * * * surrender * * * the whole of their property will be confiscated and their families turned out destitute and homeless" (dated Kingersdorf, July 9, 1900).

"When the flames burst from the doomed place the poor woman threw herself on her knees and bared her breasts, screaming 'Shoot me; shoot me. I have nothing more to live for now that my husband is gone and our farm is burned and our cattle taken.'" (Morning Leader, May 21, 1901.)

Was that in the name of democratic England? That was the order given in the fighting "for democracy" the Boer republic? He said they were to take no prisoners, that is, if the Boers surrendered, they were to be shot down. This in a civilized democracy, about which there is so much talk!

I wish to read one from another soldier:

In the last two fights we used the bayonet freely as we advanced, and the Boers appealed for mercy in vain.

That was not in Poland, not under German control, but under democratic England.

Here is another one:

A Boer was taken; he then threw down his rifle and asked for his life, and for an answer got a coarse jibe and was spitted, unarmed, on the bayonet of an English soldier.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I understand the Senator is speaking of the Boer War.

Mr. HOLT. That is correct.

Mr. LUNDEEN. If I remember correctly, the Boers had a population of just about the size of my home city of Minneapolis, about half a million people. But they stood off the British Empire for 2 years, and the British were unable to conquer them until New Zealand, Canada, Australia, and South Africa came to the aid of the Empire in the war. What was the war about? It was to gain control of the gold supply of the world. We hear talk about our gold deposits, but the British Empire produces more than half of all the gold in all the world.

Mr. HOLT. And we buy it.

Mr. LUNDEEN. At a premium. They produce most of the diamonds of the earth. The mines at times have to be shut down so that the market will not be overloaded with their diamonds. Yet they cannot afford to pay their honest debt to the United States. And France, with a million square miles more territory than we have, charges rent on the graves where our heroes rest. Some effort has been made to show that the Government is not paying that, but that American money is paying it. That is the type of empires supposed to be the captains under whom we are to be the first lieutenants. I am not sure but that we will be the corporals after awhile. This enormous wealth, which has been piled heaven high by these empires, does not satisfy them. They must go out into the world and expand.

The Senator speaks of cruelty. Take the example of the treatment accorded the German nation after the war was over. I do not know whether the Senator has mentioned that or not. There were 2 years or more of starvation, and boldly

they boasted that they were going to starve that generation of Germans so that they would grow up diminutive and dwarfed.

Mr. HOLT. In the name of democracy.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Suffering from malnutrition and privation, and starvation, all in the name of saving the world for democracy and making the world safe for—shall we say—the British Empire.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Senator. I wish to read just a few more instances, not of Poland, not of Czechoslovakia, not of things committed by Germany, but of things committed by England. Here is an exact quotation from an English soldier:

Man hunting is better than football, and that he is enjoying himself very much.

A wounded colonel cried out to his men, "Exterminate the vermin. Give them hell, boys. Make them dig their graves, and then shoot them into them"—in the name of democracy.

Yes, Mr. President; then one order went out, "Do not kill them but tear them to pieces with your bayonets." That did not occur in Poland, not in Czechoslovakia, not anywhere under German control, but under the control and in the cause of English democracy.

This is what another British officer said:

After the enemy were driven out, one of our squadrons pursued and got right in among them in the twilight, and most excellent pig sticking ensued for about 10 minutes.

Now, listen:

Most excellent pig sticking ensued for about 10 minutes, the bag being about 60. One of our men stuck his lance through two, killing them both at one thrust. Had it not been getting dark we would have killed many more.

Mr. President, that was in the name of civilization—in the name of democracy. Yet we speak of the atrocities now being committed and listen to propaganda concerning them. No one can uphold such atrocities, but I say to England and to France, "You, too, do not have clean hands, and I, for one, am not going to vote to go in the back door or the front door of war to help you again in a false cause of making the world safe for democracy."

ENGLAND'S BETRAYAL OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

It is said we have to stop Hitler because we cannot believe his word. Was the English word in connection with Czechoslovakia worth a great deal? Let me read the words of the Czechoslovakian leader after the Munich crisis. This is what was said by the Czech Minister of Propaganda of the terms forced on that great little country by the "democracies" of Europe:

For if our Government, with the President of the Republic at their head, had to decide to accept such cruel conditions, it was because they wished to spare the whole population useless bloodshed.

It is not lack of courage that has prompted our leaders to make this decision—which has stabbed us all straight to the heart. Often more courage is needed to live than to commit suicide. In the whole world there cannot be any decent men who could say that we have behaved as cowards when we authorized our Foreign Minister to tell France and Great Britain that we have decided to make this sacrifice for the sake of world peace.

Oh, what did Dr. Krofta, the Czechoslovakian Foreign Minister, say about the sell-out of Czechoslovakia—not by Germany but by England and France? Here are his exact words:

This case is unique in history. Our friends and allies have imposed on us such terms as are usually dictated to a defeated enemy.

How was Czechoslovakia destroyed? It was not destroyed by Germany alone. It was taken into the conference room and there on the operating table France, Italy, Germany, and England assassinated Czechoslovakia. The blood of Czechoslovakia is not alone on the hands of Germany. It is on the hands of two countries we are supposed to go across the sea to save because we cannot believe the words of Adolf Hitler.

Mr. President, can we believe the words of Chamberlain? The Czechoslovakians thought they could believe the words

of Chamberlain, but he "sold them down the river" when British imperialism was at stake. And do not worry, they will sell any country in the world down the river when British imperialism is at stake. Do not think that we are experts at dodging the duplicity of the English Government. We have paid the penalty dearly for believing in England. We will pay it again.

ENGLAND IN PALESTINE

Shall we believe the word of England? Remember the word England gave in Palestine to the Jews. England lied to both sides. She lied to the Arabs and lied to the Jews. Yet it is said we have to go to the aid of England because we cannot believe the words of Hitler. The Holy Land has been a tragic chessboard for Great Britain's game of opportunism and duplicity. When it suited the purpose of British imperialism did they live up to their treaties; did they live up to their Balfour declaration? No; when it became necessary they sold the Jews down the river just as they would sell anyone down the river when it suited them. And we know that the latest British White Paper on Palestine terms it in cold print, "the sacrifice to the imperial interest of a solemn obligation."

Here are the words of an American Jew, Dr. Solomon Goldman, about the word of England when it came to their imperialism. He said:

American Jewry is dismayed to find that the British Government, which was moved by a sense of justice and humanity two decades ago to give to the Jewish people a promise for the reestablishment of the Jewish national home in Palestine, has now seen fit, in a period of gravest crisis and need for the Jews in many lands of persecution, to revoke that promise and in this very act give evidence of the bankruptcy of civilization and the triumph of might over right, terror over heroic self-restraint.

Then he goes on to say:

The issuance of the Chamberlain White Paper represents a unilateral action of nullification of pledges made to the Jewish people on behalf of the entire civilized world.

I ask here, Whose word was being violated? Not Hitler's word, but the word of Great Britain, the country for which we are to help make the world safe for democracy.

Oh, we find in going through the account that the terrorism against the Jews under the control of England in Palestine is just as bad as the terrorism against the Jews and Czechs in Czechoslovakia. No one could uphold what either country has done. But I say it is not America's duty to get in with the gangsters of Europe, who have no more use for America than they have for the Jews of Palestine, the Czechs of Czechoslovakia, or the peoples of Poland. They have no love for America. Their interest is imperialistic—British imperialism against German nazi-ism. Senators may take their choice. I take neither. I say America's hope is in staying away from both of them. When two gangsters fight in the cities of the United States, it is not my duty to come in and give an arm to either one of them. But that is what we are asked to do.

Mr. President, what has been England's stand in the Orient? England signed a Nine Power Treaty to protect China, but when Japan marched into Manchuria where was England? She was where she was when Poland was invaded. She was sitting back in England, sitting back in silence, and hoping that things would come out all right. Oh, yes; and also we found out that we had stuck our neck out. England said, "Get in there, United States, and protest against the violations of the Nine Power Treaty," and pro-British Henry Stimson, who loves England next to the United States—or almost as much—stuck his neck out and said, "Oh, no; there must be no violation of the Nine Power Treaty." England then kept shoving him in, shoving him in closer, and he kept saying to Japan, "You cannot bother Manchuria," but when he looked around England was not close to him, so he had to retreat also.

Mr. President, we have thus seen examples of the betrayal of America and betrayal of other nations by the British Empire. These betrayals by the British Empire have not only taken place in the last 25 years, but for centuries upon centuries upon centuries. Vincent Sheean said this in his recent book:

Such a war will take place when or if the Fascist powers directly attack the immediate possessions of France and England, and not before; that is to say, it will be an imperialist war, fought for no principle except that of empire. The principles all went by the board in September 1938. So did the treaties, the promises, the obligations, and the frontiers; so did the structure of international law as hitherto known and partially observed. The naked greed and selfishness of all the European imperial states are so hideously exposed by the events of 1936-39 that an American must hesitate before expressing a preference between them.

Then he goes on to say in this book, which was written after he had been a correspondent in Europe for years:

From that night on I knew that France and England would never fight for anything worth fighting for; that their resistance, when it came, would come for their moneybags or their empires, never for a principle of any consequence to the human race; that no pledged word, no law, and no reason could henceforth count in the processes by which governments determined the fate of mankind. And that in the end the material catastrophe would come, that it would be far worse than it might have been this week, and that our incalculable common loss by this surrender was in vain, were certainties cold and deadly in the blue light, irrefutable in every dawn from that to this.

Oh, yes; we do not have to go beyond our borders to know of betrayal by Great Britain, and her failure to keep her word. We know about that in connection with the war debts.

It will be recalled that sometime back after the war we had an agreement with Great Britain to pay their war debt. We received a polite note saying, "We are sorry; we have no money." We had her solemn word that she would pay. She now says she has the money to buy arms and munitions with which to kill. But she did not have enough money to pay the debts honestly incurred by her.

Do not worry, Mr. President. If we repeal the arms embargo, it is a short step from cash to credit. That credit will be paid by the people of the United States, and again we shall have other war debts—if the United States Government itself exists after the war.

We are to go to Europe in order that England and France may save democracy. Do you realize that if the United States of America had been fighting shoulder to shoulder with Great Britain and France since the start of the Government in 1776 we should have been in war 121 of the 144 years up to the end of the last war? Do you know that France or England, or both of them, have been in war for 121 years and at peace for 23 years between 1776 and 1918? I refer you to the able speech of the Senator from California for a list.

Is it our duty to fight the wars of England and France? It is said we are not doing it. Mr. President, we are taking the first step toward doing it. We are in economically when we repeal the arms embargo, and we know that that is the case. The Machiavellian philosophy of diplomacy in Europe cares not about the United States. It cares not at all, because it realizes what the United States will do.

It is said that we should help England and France because they are democracies. When I picked up the newspaper this morning I noticed the headline "Turkey To Join Allies." We shall now hear that Turkey is a democracy. When Russia was with England we found out that Russia was a democracy. Now that she is with Germany, she is not a democracy. We shall have to change the dictionary definition of democracy. According to us a democracy means any government lined up with the British foreign policy. We shall have to change the definition from time to time. Of course, Rumania is a democracy!

Are we going to fight for all these countries? If Russia gets in on the right side, she can become a democracy overnight; and, of course, the penalty will be that we must fight for "democracy" in Europe.

PARALLEL FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. President, do you think we are not on the way into the battle in Europe? I charge, without fear of successful contradiction, that for some time the foreign policy of this administration has been tied to and parallel with the policy of Great Britain and France. Let me read a press dispatch of April 6, 1937, from Paris. This is what it says:

PARIS, April 6.—France and Great Britain, in fear that war may come to Europe again, have become more insistent in wooing the

support of the United States for such an eventuality today, 20 years after America entered the World War.

So fixed has the idea become that the United States would once again come to the aid of her former Allies that no speech on international politics by French and British statesmen is complete without some reference to "the ties that bind us to our brothers in the great democracy over the water."

That is just "soft soap," trying to get us over. "The ties that bind us!" Once before it was, "Lafayette, we are here." Now we can say, "Lafayette, we have been there."

Both Great Britain and France have based their efforts to insure an alliance with Washington through appeals to a common democratic form of government.

The French in particular have emphasized that the United States can ill afford to have her "two outposts of democracy"—France and Britain—beaten by an array of Fascist powers, which would then be free to turn their attention toward America.

I have heard certain Senators now listening to me say that they would vote for repeal of the arms embargo because they felt that England and France were outposts for democracy, and that if we did not help France and England Germany would come over after us.

Let me again repeat what France said in 1937:

The French, in particular, have emphasized that the United States can ill afford to have her "two outposts of democracy"—France and Britain—beaten by an array of Fascist powers, which would then be free to turn their attention toward America.

It will be said that that is the French attitude and that Americans are not responsible for it. But we are responsible for Bill Bullitt. He is our Ambassador over there, is he not? That is, between cocktail parties he is. [Laughter.] Let me quote what Bill Bullitt said, as quoted in the New York Times of September 4, 1938:

BORDEAUX, FRANCE, September 3, 1938.—United States Ambassador William C. Bullitt caused a sensation at a city hall banquet here tonight by declaring France and the United States were "indefectively united in war as in peace."

Remember, this is our Ambassador to France making an extemporaneous speech.

His extemporaneous speech was cheered by Foreign Minister Georges Bonnet, Minister of Colonies Georges Mandel, and Minister of Pensions Auguste Champetier de Ribes, as well as three senators and eight deputies who were present.

He was cheered because he said that we were united with France in war and in peace. Continuing with the article from the New York Times—and certainly the New York Times is not worried about internationalism—this is what it said:

Mr. Bullitt, who was not scheduled to speak, followed M. Bonnet, who had declared that he and Premier Edouard Daladier were doing their utmost to preserve peace "throughout the current crisis over German aims in Czechoslovakia."

France and the United States, Mr. Bullitt said, "are united by our devotion to liberty, democracy, and peace."

"We are united," he went on, "by our old friendship, by the aid we brought each other in our hour of distress. Today we are working together to save peace."

"At this time the unity and calm with which France contemplates the future have awakened the admiration of the whole world."

"It is no secret the people of the United States have a most profound sympathy today for the people of France."

Listen to this:

Most of Mr. Bullitt's speech was devoted to a eulogy of Bordeaux wines, of which wine-growing guests at the banquet said he showed "astounding knowledge."

[Laughter.]

There is no doubt about it. He knows more about the Bordeaux wines in France than he knows about the American people, if he thinks the American people are united with France in time of war and in peace. We are not united, and should not be united, with any nation in the world except in protection of our own people on this side of the Atlantic Ocean.

Let me go ahead and quote from the New York Times about Bonnet. On September 5, 1938, Bonnet asked the United States to help in peace. This dispatch is also from Bordeaux, France. That is where the great wines which I mentioned a moment ago are produced: I read:

BORDEAUX, FRANCE.—Standing beside the monument erected at Pointe de Grave by French subscription "to the glory of the

American soldiers under General Pershing who came to defend the same ideal of right and liberty that inspired the volunteers of Lafayette," Georges Bonnet, French Foreign Minister and formerly Ambassador to Washington, made this appeal today to Americans of the present day:

"I have been moved but not surprised recently to hear your countrymen declare that if France were again attacked they would come again to her defense."

Think of that, Mr. President! Did you know that we were to go to the defense of France? Georges Bonnet knew it, and said so publicly, as quoted in the New York Times. Let me repeat his statement for emphasis:

I have been moved but not surprised recently to hear your countrymen declare that if France were again attacked they would come again to her defense.

We would go to her defense. Oh, yes!

What did the French Air Minister say after the crash of the plane disclosed that we had a secret agreement with the French and English Governments on the airplane deal? This is what the French Air Minister, Guy La Chambre, said to the French Chamber of Deputies after the airplane crash:

I take this opportunity of thanking the great American democracy and its leader, President Roosevelt, for the way they have shown that they are thinking of one thing in this matter—how best to serve France.

Let me repeat that. This is Guy La Chambre speaking to the French Chamber of Deputies:

I take this opportunity of thanking the great American democracy and its leader, President Roosevelt, for the way they have shown that they are thinking of one thing in this matter—how best to serve France.

That is the trouble on the floor of the Senate. Too many are thinking how best to serve Great Britain and France. Let us think how best to serve America. Let us think of the American boys before we think of how best to serve France and how best to serve England.

Let me give a few facts about our agreement and understanding with England. Mr. President, you will remember Anthony Eden, a fine-looking man, who came over to deliver a speech to the Manufacturers Association in New York. He also wanted to see the grave of his great-great-grandfather, who, I believe, is buried over in Maryland—at least, it is close to Washington. He came to this country to deliver a speech, but this is what Mr. Eden told Parliament on December 21, 1937:

We are constantly and daily in close consultation with the Government of the United States. Over and over again, we have taken either parallel or similar action and that in itself is an indication of the closeness of such collaboration.

Will it be said that we do not have understandings? Mr. Eden thinks so; and he should know.

Here is a dispatch from London, dated January 28, which reads:

Britain was quick tonight to catch the significance of President Roosevelt's call for the vast expansion of the United States Navy. * * * It was almost as if Britain had won a war victory; for Britain calmly assumes that every new American battleship, every cruiser, destroyer, and airplane helps to safeguard the security not only of the United States but of Britain and all peaceably intentioned nations.

Did Senators know that our battleships and other naval vessels were considered by England as a great help to her? Yet that is what was said in London when we were considering increasing our Navy. Let us consider all these things together. This is what Lord Plymouth told the House of Lords on February 12, 1938:

The British Government has been in constant consultation with the Government of the United States in connection with events in the Far East. Action has been taken independently, but it has almost invariably been along parallel lines.

That is what they are asking us to do—to go along "in a parallel policy" by repealing the arms embargo to help England and France. Did not Mr. Moley tell us that the American ambassadors came back to the United States and had a conference with the President, and it was there decided what was practicable to do to stop Germany? If any Senators want to read that, it is found on pages 379 and 380 of his book,

After Seven Years. We were to determine what was best to help stop Germany. When were we set up to stop any nation except a nation that stepped upon us? When were we put on the throne as the judge of the world? When were we supposed to determine who was Satan and who was the Angel in the affairs of Europe? What authority has the United States Government to do that? Yet some want us to do it.

OUR ASSURANCE TO SUPPORT ENGLAND

Here is another quotation from a British newspaper of February 9, 1938, which I wish to read:

Great Britain has assured the United States of support in the event of direct action in the Far East.

Let Senators understand the force of that. Great Britain was going to help us in the Far East if we took action. We were not going to help Great Britain, but we were supposed to lead the parade.

Great Britain has assured the United States of support in the event of direct action in the Far East, Prof. Gilbert Murray, chairman of the League of Nations Union, said today in an address to the National Liberal Club.

"I have reason to believe on good authority that we have given the American Government assurance that we are ready to support them in any action which they may take facing any risk," Professor Murray said.

"The trouble is," he continued, "that it was a confidential communication of the government that most people here do not know of and the great American public does not know it or believe it for a moment."

Let me repeat that again. In February 1938 we were to go into the Far East to help Great Britain, and Professor Murray said:

The trouble is that it was a confidential communication of the government that most people here do not know of and the great American public does not know it or believe it for a moment.

I thought foreign relations of America were an open policy—an open book. How do we know that there have not been other secret communications for which American boys will pay the penalty on the battlefields of France?

This is what he says—and he refers to that great democracy Russia. I quote from the same article:

We could go in with America, and I think I may say there is reason to believe it is perfectly certain that if we went in with America, Russia would be on our side to support us.

That speech was made in February, 1938. Terrible communism! Secret communications! If America went in, Russia would go along to make the world safe for democracy.

What has Winston Churchill, a member of the present World War cabinet of Great Britain and one of the outstanding authorities in England, said? He is quoted in the newspaper of March 7 as follows:

Because of these arrangements—

Did you know, Mr. President, that we had any arrangements with Great Britain?

Because of these arrangements and the fact that the United States Navy was not being allowed to fall behind British expansion, we are entitled to match our naval power against the power of European countries.

We therefore are in far stronger position at sea relative to any navy in Europe today or to any likely combination of navies in Europe than we were with the larger fleet which we had in 1914.

In other words, with the American Navy and the British Navy—and did you know, Mr. President, they are together? Winston Churchill says, with these arrangements the two navies are together and that Great Britain has the largest navy in the world.

When the President of the United States delivered his "quarantine" speech in Chicago, do Senators recall that the New York Herald Tribune, which certainly on matters of foreign policy cannot be considered to be on our side, on October 6, 1938, reported that a copy of Mr. Roosevelt's speech was delivered to the British Foreign Office before he gave the address?

Did you realize, Mr. President, that the Outer Bridge speech of the President of the United States, about quarantining nations and engaging in war, was given to the British Foreign Office before he delivered the address? Why should the American President or his assistants give to the British For-

eign Office his statement on foreign policy? Let such statements be given to the American people, for they are the ones who will die if we make a mistake; they are the ones who will pay the penalty.

What did Stanley Baldwin say? He said this:

Never so long as I have any responsibility in governing this country will I sanction the British Navy being used for an armed blockade of any country in the world until I know what the United States is going to do.

That is what Stanley Baldwin said. Great Britain was not going to use the English Navy until she found out what the American people were going to do.

Now let me quote from Step by Step—and it is step by step—a book written by Winston Churchill, who is one of the leaders of England. I quote from page 111 of his book; this is what he said about the neutrality bills back in 1937:

The various neutrality bills which have been passed or discussed in Congress all seek to prevent by various methods a repetition of the past. Rather than be drawn into another Armageddon, it may be that the United States will forbid their citizens to traffic on the high seas with any belligerents at all. A kind of neutrality is now being considered which appears at first sight to be isolationist and impartial in the last degree.

Listen to this. This is what Winston Churchill thinks of cash and carry. He said:

The doctrine of cash and carry—

I should not call it cash, because the administration says it is not cash now; but returning to the quotation from Winston Churchill:

The doctrine of cash and carry means that no American ship will carry supplies to the warring countries, but if these countries choose to present themselves in ships at the American doorstep with ready money in their hands they will be allowed to buy nonmilitary supplies. This arrangement certainly has the merit of rendering to superior seapower its full deserts. It avoids for Great Britain, if engaged in war, the danger of any disputes with the United States such as caused so much anxiety in 1914 and 1915. It may be a rather chilling comfort, but it is a comfort none the less.

That is what Mr. Churchill thought about cash and carry, which really should be called clash and bury, for that is what it will be.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator probably heard the message delivered by the President of the United States on September 21 on the occasion of the first meeting of the present session of the Congress, in which the President referred to the policy of President Jefferson with regard to embargo as a ghastly mistake which led the United States into the War of 1812, a statement which I think cannot be substantiated by any historical facts. Nevertheless, did the Senator ever stop to consider the fact that the so-called embargo of the Jefferson administration was almost an exact counterpart of the present cash-and-carry proposal without any arms embargo? The so-called embargo in Jefferson's administration had nothing whatever to do with an arms embargo. It was an embargo against American shipping carrying commodities to belligerents. Therefore, if that caused the War of 1812, which, as I have said, is a suggestion to which I do not agree, nevertheless it is very strange that the administration should now return to precisely the same proposition that the President said caused the War of 1812.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. HOLT. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wanted to inquire of the able Senator from Missouri, if my recollection is correct when I state that we have been told through the pages of history that the embargo, to which the Senator referred a moment ago, during that administration actually kept the United States out of the War of 1812 for approximately 5 years theretofore?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That has always been my impression.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That was my impression about the matter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As to the exact character of the act, I refer the Senator to volume 2 of the United States Statutes at Large, page 451 and page 701, showing conclusively that those acts of the Jefferson administration were in no sense equivalent to the arms embargo of the present act, but were simply inhibitions against American shipping, very closely analogous to the so-called cash-and-carry provision of the present measure.

Mr. REYNOLDS. And, as a matter of fact, my recollection is that as a result of the action taken by the American Government at that time, our entrance into the war was delayed about 5 years.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly it was only some time after the embargo was lifted that, as a result of attempting to assert conflicting claims against two belligerents, England and France, either one of whom we might logically have gone to war against, we were finally dragged into war.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That was my recollection.

Mr. HOLT. In other words, we did not go into war when we had an embargo. We went into war when we lifted the embargo.

Going back to Winston Churchill and his Step by Step, on page 164 of his book he says:

There can be no doubt that the United States sentiment is far more favorable to Great Britain than it was in 1914.

Why does he say "1914" if he does not mean war?

This is what Mr. Churchill says:

There can be no doubt that the United States sentiment is far more favorable to Great Britain than it was in 1914.

CHURCHILL FAVORS CASH AND CARRY

And, going ahead, on the 10th day of December 1937, Mr. Churchill said:

There are, however, ways in which the United States, without exposing herself to the risk or toll of war, can give effect to the moral feelings of her people and Government and powerful aid to causes which she deems righteous. The interpretation placed upon United States neutrality in time of war would be of immense consequence to Great Britain and France. The principle embodied in recent American proposals of cash and carry is highly favorable to any power possessing the command of the sea.

Let me repeat the last two sentences:

The interpretation placed upon United States neutrality in time of war would be of immense consequence to Great Britain and France. The principle embodied in recent American proposals of cash and carry is highly favorable to any power possessing the command of the sea.

On August 4, 1938, Mr. Churchill made this statement:

The debt question, on the other hand, has encountered a new complication. The isolation forces in the United States are not favorable to a settlement which would free Great Britain from the ban imposed upon foreign loans to defaulting countries by the Johnson Act.

I call the attention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN] to that quotation:

The debt question, on the other hand, has encountered a new complication. The isolation forces in the United States are not favorable to a settlement which would free Great Britain from the ban imposed upon foreign loans to defaulting countries by the Johnson Act.

We are not in favor of again opening up the vaults and letting England come over here. We isolationists are not in favor of that.

Then Mr. Churchill goes ahead:

These forces would naturally press for the most rigorous terms and make it difficult for a reasonable compromise to be reached. The stirring of this question at this juncture and when congressional elections are already looming, would not be helpful.

Get that. Winston Churchill knows the truth about American politics when he says, "We are going to cut down the debt and try to cancel it," but—

The stirring of this question at this juncture, and when congressional elections are already looming, would not be helpful.

No; not to the reduction and not to the cancelation of war debts which are honestly due us.

But now let us go to this year and read what Winston Churchill said.

Speaking about the President's message, he said:

It would not, however, be right to look only upon the darker side. The remarkable action of President Roosevelt, undoubtedly sustained by the Government and people of the United States, in letting it be widely known that not only American moral support but also practical aid in munitions and supplies will be accorded to the western democracies should they become the victims of unprovoked aggression is a potent stabilizing force.

We did not know that we had made that agreement, but Winston Churchill, on February 9 of this year, made this statement. For emphasis, I repeat it. This is what Mr. Churchill said. He knew more about what was going on than the Senate of the United States did. These are Mr. Churchill's words:

It would not, however, be right to look only upon the darker side. The remarkable action of President Roosevelt, undoubtedly sustained by the Government and people of the United States, in letting it be widely known that not only American moral support but also practical aid in munitions and supplies will be accorded to the western democracies should they become the victims of unprovoked aggression is a potent stabilizing force.

Where did Mr. Churchill get his information? Was it given to any Senator? I never heard any Senator say, back in February, that we were going to help England and France by lifting the embargo on munitions and supplies; but on the 9th day of February 1939 Mr. Churchill said he knew it, and it would be a great, potent, stabilizing force for Great Britain.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HOLT. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator recall the date of Mr. Eden's visit to the United States to deliver a lecture on democracy?

Mr. HOLT. No; I do not. I have it, however. I quoted from it a moment ago.

Mr. BORAH. I will not bother the Senator to look up the date.

Mr. HOLT. I appreciate the Senator's inquiry; but I want to say that the Senator who introduced the proposed change in our Neutrality Act is the Senator who put Anthony Eden's speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the first day of the session. However, Anthony Eden, you know, came to the United States just to deliver a speech, and he just wanted to talk about democracies; but he seemed to get the train to Washington all right. He did not stop in New York alone. He got the train to Washington, and he did not go back to England until he had talked to people here in Washington. Of course, he just gossiped, as Lord Beaverbrook did.

But let us go back, now, to Winston Churchill. On April 13, 1939, Mr. Churchill said:

If the Nazi domination were successful in beating down the resistance of France and the British Empire, possibly assisted by the United States, there would, of course, be much loot to share.

They always have that in there—"loot to share." But, now, listen: In April 1939, Mr. Churchill thought we were going into the war. He said:

If the Nazi domination were successful in beating down the resistance of France and the British Empire, possibly assisted by the United States, there would, of course, be much loot to share.

Now let me read a press dispatch of April 13, from London, from the International News Service. This is what it said:

LONDON, April 13.—Displaying a resolution which his foreign secretary said was shared by most states of Europe and the United States, Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain today announced a Franco-British pledge of aid to Greece and Rumania in event of aggression and warned Germany and Italy to keep their hands off the Mediterranean.

Now, listen. This is the statement of the Prime Minister of England. Did you know we had an agreement to protect

Greece? Did you know we had an agreement to tell Germany and Italy to keep their hands off the Mediterranean? I read what Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain said, according to a London dispatch, on April 13:

Displaying a resolution which his foreign secretary said was shared by most states of Europe and the United States, Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain today announced a Franco-British pledge of aid to Greece and Rumania in event of aggression and warned Germany and Italy to keep their hands off the Mediterranean.

Addressing the House of Lords a few minutes after Chamberlain had announced this dramatic new departure in British peace policy on the Continent, Foreign Secretary Halifax said:

"The judgment of His Majesty's Government is not only shared by the overwhelming mass of opinion in Britain but by most states of Europe and by the United States."

Did you know that we had that agreement? England knew it but we did not. Yet the advocates of this measure say that we are not on the way to war, though we have an understanding. Of course, they want us to feel that our first line of defense is the British Empire. Of course, they want us to feel that our front-line trenches are next to the Rhine.

We have heard on the floor of the Senate, and we have heard on the radio, and we have heard in many places, "Oh, if we do not stop Germany, after she whips England and France she will come over here and get us. She will destroy the United States Government and destroy the people of the United States."

When is she coming? How is she coming? She may have enough ships to get the soldiers over here, but she has not enough ships to carry enough wheelbarrows to wheel us back in them. Oh, no; there is no danger of invasion. This is the same argument, however, which was used before the World War. I quote from the Life and Letters of Walter H. Page, by Burton J. Hendrick. This is what Mr. Page said:

If Germany wins, the war lord will set out to bestride the world, and we shall have big armies and big navies indefinitely and periodical great conflicts. The Monroe Doctrine will be less than a scrap of paper—the mere faded breath of a dead man.

Does not that sound to you like the statement of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and others about the danger to the United States if Germany wins the war? Of course the Senator from Florida was not original in that statement. The first time that was said in the present controversy was when it was said by Philip Kerr, Marquis of Lothian. He was sent over here, you know, just at this time not for any particular reason, but just because he knew more about Anglo-Saxon relations than some others, and he was sent over here to discuss those things just at this time. I do not want anybody to think there was anything wrong with that; but Lord Lothian was one of the first ones who expressed that view recently, and his words are now being echoed by the administration. Let me quote the lord himself. This is what he said:

The British Commonwealth is the United States' outer ring of security. * * * If it disappears or is smashed by the Fascist states, so that Gibraltar, the Suez, Singapore, Capetown, and the Falkland Islands fall into the hands of Germany, Italy, or Japan, then, as the British Empire disintegrates, the military powers would crowd around the United States.

So do not give Senators credit for that doctrine. It came from Lord Lothian. Let me again quote Lord Lothian—or I should give him his name—Mr. Philip Kerr, Marquis of Lothian. I ask my colleagues to see if they do not hear the same type of argument now, that if Germany is not destroyed, some moonlit night the Germans are going to slip over here and get us and take us all back to Germany, and make us Nazis. [Laughter.] The fear and the scare go over the country. Let us see what Lord Lothian said:

So long as the British Commonwealth exists the United States is secure. But suppose that in another world war it seemed likely that she would be defeated, and suppose totalitarian dictatorships seemed likely to become the heirs of British and French possessions bordering on the Atlantic (including Central and South American territory) and in the Pacific, could the United States remain indifferent to the outcome? These questions are not a mirage. They were presented in 1916. They may be presented again.

So, when people use the scare doctrine, stating that Germany is coming over here after us, they are repeating the words of Lord Lothian. But I must tell something Maj. Gen. Smedley Butler said:

If Hitler and the German Army came to the American shores to invade America, before they got back to Germany the people there would be speaking Polish, French, and Russian.

There is not a war lord in Europe who can get out of the borders of his country. We have no danger from invasion from without. What we have to meet is danger from within. Those people who are trying to shove us across the Atlantic Ocean into the war under the guise of Americanism—they are the ones to be feared. The British-American scholars, these British-American editors, these British-American after-dinner tea experts—they are the ones of whom we have to be careful in America.

Let us consider the danger. It is said I am not a military expert, and that is true. It has been said Colonel Lindbergh is not a military expert. I do not understand why the United States Army called him to duty if he was not of any benefit. I think they should have called the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], because he knows so much more about military affairs than does Colonel Lindbergh. The Army made a mistake when they did not call in the junior Senator from Texas for military advice instead of Colonel Lindbergh. But, be that as it may, let us look at some of the danger of invasion. Admiral Yarnell, before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, made this statement:

The inhabitants of the Pacific coast can sleep quietly in their beds until Japan builds a navy twice the strength of the United States.

I am sure that the Senator from California is worried lest he will wake up some night and find Hitler peeping in his bedroom. [Laughter.] Some have been using the scare doctrine. They do not tell how the enemies are coming over, but they are coming in some way, we are told.

Now, let me read what Gen. Johnson Hagood said:

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. A moment ago I heard the Senator make a very interesting statement, a statement which I believe is 100-percent correct, in addition to the other very correct statements he has made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. The one to which I particularly refer was the statement made by him only a moment ago to the effect that in his opinion our danger would not come from without but that it would come from within.

I desire to repeat that I agree with the Senator 100 percent in his statement to the effect that our danger lies within the borders of continental United States, and as proof of that I have but to recall to the attention of the Senator the fact that the press of the country only a few days ago revealed to us that, holding key posts in the United States Government, are more than 2,800 Communists; and I say that that is a shame. We are holding ourselves up as being the greatest democracy in all the world, and there are those who say that in order to maintain democracy throughout the world the United States of America should go to the aid of our brethren across the seas. Yet in our midst it is revealed by a committee of Congress, 2,800 Communists, believing in the so-called democracy that exists in Russia, are occupying important positions in our own Government.

It is true that the danger is from within.

Let me cite another instance to prove that. Since the war broke out in Europe on September 3, I have been advised of one great corporation in eastern America which, frightened by the danger of sabotage, has given employment to some 2,000 extra policemen and patrolmen to guard their property against the enemies of this Government who are seeping in daily, crossing our borders in violation of the laws of this country.

The able Senator from West Virginia will recall with me that not so very long ago the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice gave employment to several hundred

additional young men in order to search out and find the spies who are infesting our land.

It is true that the danger is from within, and I desire to repeat now, in the Senator's time, as I stated upon the floor of the Senate a few days ago, before we attempt to send the sons of American mothers across the broad expanse of the Atlantic Ocean to destroy nazi-ism in Germany or communism in Russia, we should wipe them out in this country, because they are gradually but surely undermining and destroying the very foundations of the Government we love.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Carolina, and I wish to say that when some of us were trying to weed out the terrible Communists about whom we hear so much now, and weed out the enemies from within, neither the administration nor any of its supporters lifted a finger to help us. When we made an effort to stop increased immigration in order to keep aliens from coming into this country, until Americans had jobs, the administration did not lift one finger to help us. But now that Russia is against England, it has become terrible. Therefore, the best way to get a job in some of the departments of the United States Government was to be a "fellow traveler," or to hold a card in the Communist Party. But if one holds such a card now it is not at all popular. The question of communism has now become a bugaboo, because it serves the purpose of some to have it a bugaboo. I do not know how soon again, after they put the whiskers on the Communists, if Russia goes in with England, they will shave the whiskers off and put them in strategic positions.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I wanted to comment on the question of the danger to our country lying within it. I wish to call attention to the fact that no government in history ever survived bankruptcy. I concur in the remark of the Senator from North Carolina regarding the danger confronting us from a lack of enforcement of the immigration laws; and I speak as a member of the Senate Committee on Immigration.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, we have heard today on the floor of the Senate about the danger from Russia, and we heard the other day about how Russia was going to attack Finland and how we had to go to help protect democracy from this great monster. Let me tell the Senate what England did. Lloyd George, on the third day of April of this year, made this statement in the House of Commons:

If we are going in [to help Poland] without the help of Russia, we are walking into a trap.

Russia was not so bad then, was she? Not at all. Then, on May 25 of this year, when Mr. Anthony Eden was speaking—Mr. Anthony Eden, that handsome, fine-looking gentleman, whose pictures so many love to look at—he made the following statement, as appears in the Birmingham Post:

If an effective resistance to aggression is to be organized in western Europe, Russia's whole-hearted cooperation is indispensable.

Russia was not so bad then, when they were helping England, according to Lloyd George and according to Anthony Eden. When did Russia get bad? When did the rot get into the apple?—just recently? or was it a long time ago?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Missouri for the purpose suggested by him?

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the Senator from Missouri for that purpose.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll,

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	King	Russell
Andrews	Donahay	La Follette	Schwartz
Austin	Downey	Lee	Schwellenbach
Bailey	Ellender	Lodge	Sheppard
Bankhead	Frazier	Lucas	Shipstead
Barbour	George	Lundeen	Slattery
Barkley	Gerry	McCarran	Smathers
Bilbo	Gibson	McKellar	Stewart
Borah	Gillette	McNary	Taft
Bridges	Green	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Guffey	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Gurney	Minton	Townsend
Burke	Hale	Murray	Truman
Byrd	Harrison	Neely	Tydings
Byrnes	Hatch	Norris	Vandenberg
Capper	Hayden	Nye	Van Nuys
Caraway	Herring	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Chandler	Hill	Overton	Walsh
Chavez	Holman	Pepper	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pittman	White
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, before the quorum call I was discussing the question of national defense and whether or not we would be in danger of invasion by Germany in case Great Britain and France lost the war. I said that it had been stated quite freely by a number of Senators that such a danger existed, but that doctrine was not new; that they had only used the words of Lord Lothian, the British Ambassador. I have just quoted Admiral Yarnell to show the lessening of that danger.

Gen. Johnson Hagood had this to say:

No army could come across the Atlantic ocean, because there is no nation that has a sufficient army and at the same time a sufficient number of ships and a navy to support it.

Of course some persons try to scare us by saying that enemy forces will try to penetrate South America. The best way to look at that scare is to look at the geography books. By glancing at the map it will be found that no cannon on earth can shoot from South Africa to the United States of America.

If the enemy were in South America it would in some instances be as far away and in others farther away than if it were in Europe. But those who make such assertions hope that by propaganda setting forth the danger for America they can make the American people do something they would not otherwise do, something they would not do if they were not afraid.

Mr. President, it is asserted by some that enemy forces would attack from the west and east at the same time. Speaking of a possible attack from the east, President Roosevelt, writing in Asia magazine, made this statement:

If, with a fleet double the size of Japan's and our vastly greater resources, invasion of the western shores of the Pacific was admitted to be probably impossible, certainly impracticable, for us, how much more formidable was the corresponding problem presented to the military strategists of Japan.

How can we be successfully attacked from the East? Some may say the invaders will go to Alaska and attack us from Alaska. Of course, those who say that do not tell us how Japan is going to get past the Canadian Rockies. I suppose she is going to fly her big tanks over the Canadian Rockies. Or if she cannot fly them over, she will outfit all the Japanese soldiers with snowshoes so they can climb over the mountains in the wintertime and get at us in that way. Anyone who has been through Canada knows that the assertion of the possibility of an attack by way of Alaska is absolutely nonsensical. However, it is not unusual to hear nonsense these days.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What the Senator is saying about the possibility of a Japanese attack upon the United States through Alaska reminds me very much of the expression attributed to Napoleon when he said that he had figured

out seven different ways to land an army in England, but he never had figured out a way to get an army out of England.

Doubtless the Senator is a little too young to remember the old predecessor of the German war scare and the fear of Germans coming over and attacking the United States. I refer to the Japanese war scare. Thirty years ago that was the great war scare. The Japanese were expected to come over at any time and attack the United States, take all the United States west of the Rockies—perhaps more—and hold it indefinitely. That was at a time when Great Britain was the hard-and-fast ally of Japan for both offensive and defensive purposes. However, the people of the United States were not sufficiently scared to sleep under the bed at night. As a matter of fact, even when Great Britain was the hard-and-fast ally of Japan, Japan never did come over here and attack us and never did take the Pacific coast and keep it. I think, in view of that experience and in view of the recurring fear of German attacks on the United States for the past 25 years without anything developing, the people of the United States may have a certain sense of security in the two great oceans with which God has blessed us for defense, in the tremendous magnitude of the manpower of the United States, and in the naval and air forces with which the people of the United States have provided the Government.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Senator from Missouri. It is very interesting to know that the English Channel, small as it is, has kept England free from invasion for nearly a thousand years. We are protected by 3,000 miles of water, and yet we hear talk about Germany coming over here to attack us. Of course, I suppose some of us could be so naive as to believe that Hitler is teaching every one of his German soldiers how to swim so that they can swim over here and get us and take us back.

Oh, yes; the question of the danger of invasion is just another one of the propaganda "gags" to get us to go over on the other side before Germany comes over here. I think we are in a much stronger position to meet attack on this side than we would be if we went over there. Even in baseball it is said that it is better to play on your own field. I do not know; but I know that whenever I was in my own backyard I could call a boy more names than if I were in his backyard. If we are on this side of the Atlantic, we are safer than if we are on the other side of the Atlantic.

During the World War we had the English Navy to help us; we had the French Navy to help us; we had our own Navy, and 2 other navies. We had 5 navies to transport American soldiers to France. We were guarded by patrols of the battleships of those nations. We landed in a friendly port, either in France or in England. We were protected until the time we reached the front-line trenches. Yet with all that protection the greatest number of men the United States ever took to Europe in any single month was 306,000. During the war we took fewer than 10,000 soldiers a day to France. Would we be in danger of 10,000 soldiers coming to the ports of the United States? How would they get into our ports? Smedley Butler said they might dump the tanks overboard half way across the ocean and meet them on Broadway. [Laughter.] But I do not see, and I do not believe anybody with any sound degree of intelligence can prove to anybody else of sound intelligence, that we are in danger of successful invasion. Furthermore, if we are in danger of attack, the way to destroy our defense is to go over there. Let us build our defense in the United States of America instead of over there.

I am not one of those who believe that our frontier is on the Rhine. I find that those who feel that our frontier is on the Rhine stay on this side of the Atlantic when war comes.

I am sorry I was not present in the Chamber yesterday to hear the talk about how we would not vote for war because many have sons. Of course, I have no sons. I am not even married. But the argument was that because many have sons we would not vote to send the boys to war. Mussolini has a number of sons.

It is nice for us to sit here and say that we should use force, and should stop the dictators.

SENATORS EXEMPT FROM DRAFT

We are not going to stop them. Let me read what the draft law is. Who is exempt from military service in time of war?

The Vice President of the United States, the officers, legislative, executive and judicial, of the United States and of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia shall be exempt from the selective draft herein subscribed.

We can be very brave in this air-conditioned Capitol. We are exempt. Who ever heard of a son of a Senator being a buck private in the trenches? There may be, but I do not know of any such. The President's sons all have commissions, all the way from lieutenant up to colonel. But the boys of West Virginia will go in as buck privates. While we are talking about involvement in war, I want to see an amendment of the draft law so that we cannot sit back in safety and exempt ourselves from the draft and send other boys to the trenches of France, where some say our frontier is. I wish I had been present yesterday so that I might have had the opportunity to read the law.

In speaking about bringing men over here in a war, it must be remembered that 1,350,000 tons of shipping were required to carry the supplies of the United States Army alone during the war; 3,600,000 tons of shipping would be required to carry 300,000 men across with sufficient supplies, I am told. Between the months of April and December 1917, we carried only 49,515 men to France. And yet we talk about the danger of invasion. I would rather take the word of the military experts of the United States than that of the so-called military experts of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In addition to the remarkable figures the Senator has just read concerning our transportation of a military force to France during the years 1917 and 1918, I should like to suggest to the Senator that that case is not entirely analogous, for the reason that we were landing in a friendly country, behind a tremendous force of the Allies, and it was not necessary for us to take mechanized equipment, or armament to any substantial extent, because we obtained our cannon and our equipment for the most part after we landed in France, from the British and French.

An invading force coming to this country would be required not only to transport its manpower and supplies, which we necessarily had to do, but would also be required to transport cannon, munitions, and the highly mechanized equipment on which European armies now depend, which was not at all necessary for us in 1917 and 1918. So the discrepancy is even greater than the figures, shown by the Senator, demonstrate.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

It is said that we shall not have war because we are personally interested. This morning I picked up a newspaper and noticed this headline: "House of Lords flees to cellar." They were the ones who voted to send the English boys to the trenches of France. Let me read:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of October 18, 1939]

HOUSE OF LORDS FLEE TO CELLAR

LONDON, October 17.—The sedate House of Lords moved with unwonted speed today. After a German plane was sighted over the Firth of Forth, air-raid alarms were sounded from Yorkshire coast towns to Chatham on the Thames. Quicker than you can say "Firth of Forth" the Lords suspended their sitting and retired to the basement of the Parliament Building. They came out only after getting word that the alarms were not meant for London.

Oh, yes; it is brave to sit back and send boys to die in the trenches; but, as the article says, the House of Lords got to the basement of Parliament before you could even say "Firth of Forth." But the boys in the front-line trenches did not get there.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am wondering if Mr. Winston Churchill was one of the gentlemen who fled to the cellar.

Mr. HOLT. I understand that three men were hurt in his efforts to reach there first.

Mr. REYNOLDS. A moment ago the Senator mentioned Mr. Churchill. At this time, with the Senator's permission, I desire to bring to his attention a statement made by Mr. Winston Churchill to an American newspaper publisher about a year ago in reference to the appreciation of the British for the assistance provided them during our participation in the war from April 1917 to November 11, 1918.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the interest of accuracy, it ought to be stated that Mr. Winston Churchill is not a member of the House of Lords.

Mr. REYNOLDS. But he is a member of Parliament.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I understood the newspaper article to state that the members of Parliament fled to the cellar.

Mr. BARKLEY. The newspaper article referred only to the House of Lords.

Mr. HOLT. You need not worry, Mr. President. The House of Commons was already in the basement. [Laughter.]

Mr. REYNOLDS. They were already there?

Mr. HOLT. Yes; they were already there.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLT. I gladly yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. With the Senator's permission, I should like to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 19, 1939:

During a recent trip to Europe, Mr. Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty in the British Cabinet during the World War, invited Mr. Griffin to call on him at his home in London. During the course of a long visit Mr. Churchill asked what were some of the questions uppermost in the minds of the American people regarding Anglo-American relations. The questions were asked by Winston Churchill of Mr. William Griffin, his American guest. Mr. Griffin told Mr. Churchill that the outstanding issue in the United States that was disturbing Anglo-American relations was England's failure to pay her war debt.

Mr. Churchill then said to Mr. Griffin:

"I think that England should pay every single dollar she has borrowed from your country. But before paying in full she should be allowed to deduct half the cost of all the shot and shell she fired at the Germans from the time America declared war until she put soldiers in the front-line trenches over a year later."

Asked if we allowed England to make the deduction in question, how much it would amount to, Mr. Churchill answered: "I was in a position to know just how much it cost England to carry on the war, and, according to my figures, England should be allowed to deduct \$4,900,000,000 from the debt America claims England owes her before a final settlement is made. When you declared war you became partners in war, and therefore your country should be willing to bear its just cost of carrying on the war."

Mr. Griffin then told Mr. Churchill that it was our opinion that America had saved the British Empire from destruction and from overwhelming defeat. Mr. Churchill disagreed with him regarding America's contribution toward winning the war and stated unequivocally that although he was enthusiastic over our declaration of war, he could now see that it was all a horrible mistake and that we should have stayed at home and attended to our own business.

Mr. HOLT. He said that after the war, did he not?

Mr. REYNOLDS. He said after the war that we should have stayed at home and attended to our own business and kept our nose out of their business.

Mr. Churchill said England would not have lost the war, because, said he:

"We would have made peace with Germany in the spring of 1917, and by so doing would have saved over a million British and French lives."

"America's entrance into the war was disastrous not only for your country but for the Allies as well, because had you stayed at home and minded your own business we would have made peace with the Central Powers in the spring of 1917, and then there would have been no collapse in Russia, followed by communism; no break-down in Italy, followed by fascism; and nazi-ism would not at present be enthroned in Germany. If America had stayed out of the war and minded her own business, none of these 'isms' would today be sweeping the Continent of Europe and breaking down parliamentary government."

Mr. HOLT. Of course he said that after a hundred thousand Americans were killed in the effort to "make the world safe for democracy."

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. According to newspaper stories, about 10 days ago or so, since the present war in Europe started, Mr. Churchill has repudiated that statement entirely and has said he never gave out such a statement.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I was wondering if the Senator from North Carolina stated where we could find the statement of Mr. Churchill to which he has referred?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 19, 1939, page 7452, and there are also statements made by Lloyd George, and others.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, to bolster that let me quote from Winston Churchill's own book, *The Aftermath*, page 104. This is what he thought of the Americans:

Even in this month of extreme American effort, nearly four British, French, and Italian soldiers were falling every day to one American. The stake of the United States in the European scene was incomparably small, yet here was a direct threat that if Great Britain, France, and Italy did not swallow the 14 points whole, whatever they might be, or be claimed to be, the United States would withdraw from the line, make a separate peace with Germany and Austria, leave the scene in perfect confusion, and condemn the world to another year of war. It is a measure of Lloyd George's quality when acting for his country that he did not quail before this unwarrantable pressure.

That is what Winston Churchill thought about us after the war, but Mr. Churchill does not now entertain that view. Let me quote also from Mr. Churchill's book, on page 478. This is what he there says:

President Wilson sought to play a part out of all proportion to any stake which his country had contributed or intended to contribute to European affairs. . . .

The influence of mighty, detached, and well-meaning America upon the European settlement was a precious agency of hope. It was largely squandered in sterile conflicts and half-instructed and half-pursued interferences.

That is what Mr. Churchill thought of our entrance into the war. But now when we can be of help to England, now when we can sell supplies, followed by the sending of men, we do not hear such a statement from Mr. Churchill.

Now as to the question of danger to America. Because of propaganda the thought of danger is absolutely sweeping America, but it is a definitely attempted propaganda effort on the part of England in order to influence us. I cannot help but repeat to the Senate some of the words that were written by a Kansas editor about that. This is what he said, and I think they are very touching words:

I don't want to get poison gas in my lungs. I don't want a piece of shrapnel in my stomach. I don't want my legs riddled by machine-gun bullets. I don't want maggots crawling in my brains that have been laid open by a splinter from an aerial bomb. I don't want to die. I am 37 and want to live. I hate those who have brought the United States closer to war today than it was in 1915. I wasn't old enough to fight then, but I was old enough to watch the war hysteria being aroused until it tempted the United States into a ruthless struggle for power in Europe. And I was old enough to see what it cost then and since.

That's why I hate those who today are deliberately stirring emotions in favor of one side or another in that bloody European conflict which again is on the verge of breaking out of council chambers and onto battlefields. Officials of our Government who already have taken sentimental sides, members of Communist and Fascist organizations alike, those with munitions to sell, open and secret agents of other nations, professional busybodies, and all others in this country who have been knowingly rousing passions, I damn alike.

These passion rousers have done their work well. There are tens of thousands whose dreams tonight will be filled with gray-clad legions marching down through Canada to spread desolation in their wake, with skies black with bombing planes and with battleships flying the flag of the rising sun shelling the whole west coast. In waking hours they fear secret agents of foreign powers are about to poison the water they drink or are busy raising armies of hyphenated citizens which very soon will ravish their wives and daughters

and make them slaves. They are almost ripe again for that old catch phrase, "making the world safe for democracy." These I do not hate; I pity.

Because there are so many with such thoughts as those, I am personally afraid. I fear their emotions have betrayed them so far there is no turning back. If that isn't true, there is only one thing that will save them and me. One thing alone can stop all of us from repeating even more tragically the tragic mistake of 1917. That is some rational thinking.

Oh, we know that there are many in America who feel that we are going to be invaded. Does anybody here say that to repeal the arms embargo is a step away from war? How can we supply a club to a man fighting and at the same time say we want to stop the fight? How can you supply a gun to kill someone and still say, "I did not have a part in the killing?"

Of course we add fuel. Let me quote the words of the Secretary of State at that particular time. This is what he said about the danger of that course, and I want to read it:

To us that seemed absurd, and we said so.

I am quoting from the statement of Hon. Cordell Hull at page 42 of the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee in 1936.

We could not see how a neutral could deliberately help to feed the fires and flames of war by delivering the essential materials right straight to the belligerents, helping not only to carry on war but to prolong it indefinitely; and nobody knows much better than we, that every day that war is prolonged, the danger of the war spreading would be increased, with increased dangers to us of being involved.

We all realize that that is the case. We are supplying guns, ammunition, and implements of war, for what purpose? Not to stop the war, but material that will prolong the war.

FAILURE TO ENFORCE NEUTRALITY ACT

Oh, you say, "But the arms embargo act has not worked, because it has not worked in Japan and China." As I said yesterday on the floor of the Senate, the failure to put the arms embargo in effect as to Japan and China was not the fault of the law; it was the fault of the President of the United States to declare the state of war. Everybody in the world knew there was a war in China, everybody knew there was a state of war existing, except the President of the United States. He could have immediately stopped many of the bombing planes from America that killed Chinese citizens if the embargo had been put into effect.

You say, "There was no declaration of war." I realize that there was no declaration of war; but was there a declaration of war when Italy invaded Ethiopia? No; there was no declaration of war, but the President of the United States put into effect the arms embargo on the 5th day of October 1935. The number of the proclamation is 2141. Not only did he put the arms embargo in effect in the Italo-Ethiopian trouble, but he issued a proclamation warning American citizens against traveling on the vessels of belligerent nations. That proclamation, No. 2142, was issued on October 5, 1935.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In view of the fact that the Senator a few moments ago mentioned Mr. Anthony Eden, who was good enough to honor us with his presence in this country after Great Britain found she was likely to be again involved in war, and in further view of the fact that the Senator from West Virginia has just mentioned the difficulties that were going on in Ethiopia, the Senator will recall that in 1935, according to my best recollection, the British had a considerable amount of tonnage in the form of warships in the Mediterranean. At that time Italy was making aggressions in Ethiopia; and at that time the Senator no doubt will recall that Mr. Anthony Eden was insisting that the United States of America join Great Britain in the enforcement of sanctions in reference to oil going to Italy for use by Italy in her conquest of the Abyssinian territory. At the same time that Anthony Eden was endeavoring to get us to join Great Britain in the enforcement of sanctions on oil to Italy, the British were selling, weekly, thousands upon thousands of dollars' worth of gasoline and oil to the Italians for the purpose of their carrying on their conquest of Abyssinia.

I may also state to the Senator that it is my understanding that at the present time the British have 100,000 Indian troops, the larger number from the state of Kashmir, in north India, guarding several miles of the Suez Canal from north to south. A great many of those troops at present are at Aden, Arabia; and I have several times heard the opinion expressed that if Great Britain succeeds in forcing Italy on her side, she will do so by closing the Mediterranean between Casablanca and Gibraltar and refusing the admission of any Italian ships to the Suez Canal. By doing that, Italian ships naturally would be locked in the Mediterranean and in the Adriatic, which has been made, as a matter of fact, nothing more or less than an Italian lake since Italy took over Albania several months ago.

It has been further said by observers who have recently traveled in that section that if the British do close the seas to the Italian merchant marine and the Italian Navy outside of the Mediterranean, she will thereby cut off any food supplies or ammunition going down to Abyssinia. They further have observed, from information they stated they had in hand, that the British had made arrangements to transport thousands upon thousands of rifles and light artillery and machine guns for the purpose of placing them in the hands of the Abyssinians, who have been partially conquered by the Italians, so that the Abyssinians may, with the arms provided by Great Britain, reconquer in whole that portion of the Abyssinian empire which was taken over by the Italians, and, that being done, that Great Britain then will herself take over Abyssinia, being interested in it because Mussolini on several occasions has threatened to cut off the headwaters of the Nile, thereby destroying a portion of the Egyptian Sudan, and further interested because, as the Senator will recall, Abyssinia is just north of British Somaliland, and Great Britain would be interested in that territory.

I thank the Senator for permitting this interruption.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Senator from North Carolina very much. There is no doubt about it; England has played either with the aggressors or against the aggressors, depending upon whether or not the aggression touched her. The English hate aggressors when the aggressors touch or approach a single foot of the British Empire. But where were the British when Czechoslovakia was destroyed by an aggressor? They were sitting around a conference table, agreeing to that aggression. And in the Italo-Ethiopian war, when it suited England's purpose, the British put on the sanctions, and then they took them off, depending upon whether or not it helped England.

But going back to the question of our part in that matter, the President issued a statement and put into effect the arms embargo in the Italo-European War, and this is why he did it. I quote the words of his statement on October 5:

In view of the situation which has unhappily developed between Ethiopia and Italy, it has become my duty under the provisions of the joint resolution of Congress approved August 31, 1935, to issue, and I am today issuing, my proclamation making effective an embargo on the exportation from this country to Ethiopia and Italy of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. Notwithstanding the hope we entertained that war would be avoided, and the exertion of our influence in that direction, we are now compelled to recognize the simple and indisputable fact that Ethiopian and Italian armed forces are engaged in combat, thus creating a state of war within the intent and meaning of the joint resolution.

He recognized that Italy and Ethiopia were fighting without a declaration of war. Why has he not recognized Japan's invasion of China? Is it trade? Why has he not put the embargo in effect against Russia? Is not Russia in a state of war with Poland? Has not she done just the same thing that Italy did in Ethiopia? Oh, yes; but the arms embargo is not invoked against Russia. Why? Because it suits the purpose of the advocates of this measure as a good propaganda element to say that we can sell to Russia. Is that why? There is war between Russia and Poland today, and it is the duty of the President of the United States to put an embargo on the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to Soviet Russia. Why does he not do it?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I believe yesterday the press reported that fighting is still going on in eastern Poland between the Soviet and the remnant of the Polish Army. I was rather surprised to read it; I thought the fighting was all over; but it seems that there is still a sort of skirmishing going on in the rather sparsely settled country in the eastern part of Poland. Prior to that there were rather sizable conflicts between Soviet and Polish troops, when the Soviet troops first marched into Poland.

I mention this fact because some persons have an idea that there was just a parade of Soviet troops into Poland. As a matter of fact, some real fighting was going on.

Mr. HOLT. Poland knows that there is war with Russia; the world knows that there is war with Russia; but the President of the United States seems not to know it. Why does he not put into effect the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war going to Russia? Does it stand in the way of propagandizing the repeal of the arms embargo? Do not Senators think the Polish soldiers who were killed by the Communist armies as they marched into Poland knew a war was going on there?

Why has there been a difference? All we can do is to put the law on the books, and it is the President's duty to enforce it. He should have put the embargo on arms into effect against Japan, as Japan marched into China. But it was not done.

Now I wish to go to the question of the war trade, but in closing about these men who represent us in Europe, this foreign-affairs group, whom do we have, and what has their statement been? We have Tony Biddle and Bill Bullitt, and a group of social tea hounds. Do they give us that which suits their purpose? Poor Tony Biddle.

It did disturb him when Warsaw was bombed. He had to cancel some of his cocktail parties. He had to stay away from the teas that were given. After Mr. Biddle, in Poland, and Mr. Bullitt, in France, get through with 4 o'clock teas and 6 o'clock cocktails, it is too bad for America by 9 o'clock. [Laughter.] It is time we were getting a few American ambassadors who think, not best how to serve the country they are in, but how best to serve the United States of America. Look at the collection of some of our ambassadors and it will be possible to see the reason of our confusion in foreign affairs.

Now, let me discuss the other point. That we should repeal the arms embargo because it will give trade to the United States, because it will mean cash, that it will give us some money. That is the second reason given for the repeal of the arms embargo.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Before the Senator leaves the Ambassadors, I am wondering whether my recollection serves me correctly. It seems to me we had an Ambassador in Germany just before the World War by the name of Gerard, who, when he was withdrawn, did not return to the United States right away. He first went over to visit the King of England, the Emperor of India, and knelt down before him and was knighted, was made a Knight of the Bath, a member of the British nobility, as near to royalty as he could get. Then he came home and ran for President in South Dakota, my native State, but he received short shrift at the hands of the South Dakota farmers and never ran for President again.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. We all realize that our foreign affairs have been conducted with too much emphasis on the tea and cocktails and not enough emphasis on American interests, or the people who are not interested in tea and cocktails.

I realize how easy it is to spread propaganda, and our ambassadors have furthered that propaganda. When we send an ambassador to France or an ambassador to Poland, we send him as our representative.

OUR WAR TRADE, 1914-17

Now, as to the point about the arms embargo, and the effect it has on the trade of America, can we not see the deadly parallel between 1914-17 and today? Can we not see that we are going down the same identical path? Can we not see whither we are now starting, by opening up the munitions factories to sell machines of death? Are we not going down the path we started on 22 years ago? Let me read something about the conditions in 1914 to 1917. We started to sell munitions, arms, implements, and supplies of war, and writing in May 1916, Ray Stannard Baker, in his *Life of Woodrow Wilson*, used this language:

Trade between the United States and the Allies had become the great artery which, flowing westward, fed American war prosperity, and, flowing eastward, sustained the life of the allied armies and populations. Diplomats and statesmen alike dreaded any policy that threatened to contract that life-giving stream. Even the boldest pronouncements and demands of the President fell short of being vital. Nevertheless, there was always the danger, which the diplomats of the belligerent nations had to watch narrowly, that some outrage would prove a breaking point, or that this strange President, with his ideals and his moral convictions, might—there was horror in the thought—bring his vast nation into the war on the wrong side.

It brought us to the point where an incident could get us into war.

We were in the war trade. It was under the name of neutrality. In the *Intimate Papers of Colonel House* one finds the following:

Allied public opinion was forgetful of the assistance brought to the cause of the Entente by the United States, which, by a slightly stricter interpretation of the role of a neutral, President Wilson could have prevented—the enormous loans, the shipment of munitions.

What did Ambassador Gerard write Colonel House? According to that excellent book *Propaganda for War*, by Professor Peterson, we find he wrote the following:

There is no doubt * * * that a real neutrality would stop the sale, but would our people "stand" for such a curtailment of American industry?

We find this in the *New York Times* of October 20, 1916:

Only 3 weeks before the election the British Chancellor of the Exchequer displayed the bare bones of the situation when he declared (October 19) that the British would need to spend nearly \$10,000,000 daily, for every working day, for their purchases in America.

Why did the British purchasing agent wait until 3 weeks before the November election in 1916 to make the statement? Was it to convince the people of the need of British purchases, and therefore tie us up with their victory?

In Professor Peterson's book, an interesting story is told. It follows:

A correspondent of Sir Gilbert Parker wrote: "Within earshot of my own house 16,000 workmen are busy, day and night * * * making munitions for England. Other factories of * * * (munitions?) and other war supplies are being enlarged or built new in this one city of New Haven." Could it be other than that these thousands of workmen and people dependent upon them should be friendly to the British and anxious to have them win—even if it finally took American assistance?

Today we are grabbing for the profits, and, just like the mouse that grabs for the cheese in the trap, we are not going to get the cheese before our neck is caught. We are grabbing for the bait, and we are grabbing at profits.

Let me quote further from Ray Stannard Baker:

The British would probably have to sell or pledge their very industrial empire to American bankers in the form of stocks and bonds of British factories; and beyond that, since the complicated economic structure of the United States would then rest still more heavily upon allied purchases, might there not be widespread bankruptcy in America? All these were threatening possibilities unless peace came promptly, or the United States entered the war.

Also we find the following from Mr. Baker:

On the other hand British relationships, which had somewhat improved since the explosions of American irritation over the black list, were approaching a new and far more fundamental crisis. The Allies were running out of money! They could not go on with the war without a continuous flow of supplies from America, for which they could no longer pay in cash, or in repatriated securities, or in temporary bank loans. A radical new policy for credits—involving vast new financial machinery—appeared absolutely neces-

sary if one or both of two catastrophes were to be avoided; either the speedy defeat of the Allies, or an industrial and financial crisis of the first magnitude in America—since our economic system was now overwhelmingly dependent upon trade with Great Britain and France.

The English financiers would face bankruptcy or war because of the trade we started in 1914.

What did Secretary Lansing say? He presented two reasons why we should go to war on the side of the Allies: First, our economic interest, and, second, our love of democratic institutions.

"Our economic interests." It certainly was not an economic interest to the boys who died in France. Who made the profits we started to grab in 1914-17, and who will make the profits we are now starting to grab out of war trade, out of the trade in the munitions of death?

I quote also from Ray Stannard Baker the following important statement as to the development of war munitions trade. He said:

And yet, however the President may have striven to subordinate or moralize the economic factors of the conflict, they were there, as always, enormously potent influences behind the scenes. At the beginning of the European war he had tried to curb their influence by a "moral" loan policy but had found it, by September 1915, impossible to maintain. The effect of our rapidly expanding wartime trade—trade that was then perfectly legal—was to entangle us vitally with the welfare of the Allies. The President saw clearly and feared this tendency; he considered that there was "a moral obligation laid upon us to keep free the courses of our commerce and of our finance" from entanglements with either group of belligerents that we might use our increasing economic power for the benefit of the world.

Then he stated:

Whether these vast economic forces were to be used selfishly or altruistically, there they were—realities, facts—and the President himself saw that "we have interests which we see being drawn slowly into the maelstrom of this tremendous upheaval." The war, indeed, had reached the point where everything that happened in Europe immediately affected America.

What will be the result of the repeal of the arms embargo? It will put us right back to where we were in 1914-17, by gearing our economic machinery to wartime trade; and the President will find himself in the same position in which President Woodrow Wilson found himself in 1916. He will find, as was said in this article—

If we should go to war with Germany, the greatest help we could give the Allies would be such a credit.

Unless we go to war with Germany, our Government, of course, cannot make such a direct grant of credit, but is there no way in which our Government might indirectly, immediately, help the establishment in the United States of a large Franco-British credit without a violation of armed neutrality?

Perhaps our going to war is the only way in which our present preeminent trade position can be maintained and a panic averted.

In 1917 the soldiers thought they were going to war to end all wars. They thought they were going to war to make the world safe for democracy, that they were going to war to crush Prussianism, to destroy the Kaiser. They fought for an ideal. But what was said back in those times?

Perhaps our going to war is the only way in which our present preeminent trade position can be maintained and a panic averted.

Let me now read the words of Secretary of State Lansing as to how this wartime trade got us into the war. I quote Secretary Lansing:

If the European countries cannot find means to pay for the excess of goods sold to them over those purchased from them, they will have to stop buying and our present export trade will shrink proportionately. The result would be restriction of outputs, industrial depression, idle capital and idle labor, numerous failures, financial demoralization, and general unrest and suffering among the laboring classes.

Then he asked the President:

Can we afford to let a declaration as to our conception of the true spirit of neutrality, made in the first days of the war, stand in the way of our national interests, which seem to be seriously threatened?

That is what Secretary Lansing said:

Can we afford to let a declaration as to our conception of the true spirit of neutrality, made in the first days of the war, stand in the way of our national interests, which seem to be seriously threatened?

LXXXV—36

Next year or perhaps the year afterward will some secretary in the Cabinet say, "We have a financial interest in the war. We have established our trade on a wartime basis." And then will he say to the President, "Can we afford to let a declaration of our conception of the true spirit of neutrality, made in the first days of the war, stand in the way of our national interests which seem to be seriously threatened?"

Talk about cash! Of course it was never intended that the sales would be for cash. I am glad the administration have admitted it publicly. They did not admit it publicly until they were driven back to the wall and needed votes in the other House. That is why they are submitting an amendment for the measure. Do not fool yourselves; the reason why the Pittman amendment was submitted in the Senate was that votes were needed in the House of Representatives, and they could not be obtained so long as this fake cash scheme was in the measure. That is why the provision for cash was put in it.

Mr. President, what did Secretary McAdoo say in 1915 about that matter? He said:

The high prices for food products have brought great prosperity to our farmers, while the purchases of war munitions have stimulated industry and have set factories going to full capacity throughout the great manufacturing districts, while the reduction of imports and their actual cessation in some cases have caused new industries to spring up, and others to be enlarged. Great prosperity is coming. It will be tremendously increased if we can extend reasonable credits to our customers. * * * Our prosperity is dependent on our continued and enlarged foreign trade.

Mr. President, will a Secretary of the Treasury in the President's Cabinet say that our prosperity is dependent upon our foreign trade? Will he say that? The prosperity of America does not have to be based on wartime trade with Europe. The basis for prosperity should lie within the United States of America. Our prosperity does not have to be built on the dead, wounded, shell-shocked youth of the world, and neither does it have to be built on the shells and bombs that kill innocent men, women, and children in Europe. Our prosperity should be right here in America, built upon the sound basis of business in America, and we can so build it. But back in 1915 some were afraid of the collapse that might come, and they were afraid of the penalty they would have to pay for that collapse.

MUNITIONS TRADE, 1914-17

Oh, yes; the munitions trade itself played a great part in the World War; not only the wartime trade but the munitions trade. I quote again from Ray Stannard Baker:

It was inevitable that with the shipment of such enormous quantities of war materials to the Allies, the problem of paying for them would again arise. For a considerable time the British could finance their purchases through their large credit balance, but if the war continued even a quarter billion dollars would not last long. And when all was said, if the shipment of war materials was unobjectionable, why not loans of money? And if credits were not given, how could the munitions traffic continue? And if shipments were cut off, what would happen to American business?

Then telling about the entanglements—and they also were discussing embargo at that time—he said:

Meanwhile Congress was discussing retaliatory legislation. It was a prickly subject. An embargo on loans and supplies was an action this Government had repeatedly declared to be, in its international results, an unneutral course of action. Moreover, domestic repercussions might prove utterly devastating to industrial, commercial, and financial interests which now relied upon our inflated and expanding foreign trade.

All the way through we find the effect of munitions traffic on our actions before the World War. As early as the end of the year 1914 the traffic in war materials with the Allies had become deeply entrenched.

Thus by the end of the year 1914 the traffic in war materials with the Allies had become deeply entrenched in America's economic organization, and the possibility of keeping out of the war by the diplomacy of neutrality, no matter how skillfully conducted, had reached the vanishing point. By October, perhaps earlier, our case was lost.

When the embargo was discussed in 1916 was England interested? Here is how England was interested. Sir Edward Grey expressed the hope that the bill introduced by

Mr. Hitchcock in the Senate to embargo munitions would not pass.

England was interested. Here is what Ambassador Gerard wrote to Colonel House:

There is no doubt * * * that a real neutrality would stop the sale, but would our people "stand" for such a curtailment of American industry?

What we find all through that period is that the American munitions trade was the first step to our entry into the war.

What did Mr. Garvin, the editor of the London Observer, say? He said:

The American supply of munitions was indispensable to reinforce our own efforts in the last world struggle. The same reinforcement obviously would be indispensable in any further conflict.

And Ray Stannard Baker makes this definite statement:

However we may repudiate the motive, the intricate business connections with the Allies developed during 1914, 1915, and 1916, until the very economic life of the country rested upon the munitions traffic, stimulated a powerful interest in the victory of the Allies.

Former Congressman Henry Rainey placed in the RECORD a statement by a London banker about our possible embargo during the trying period before the World War. This banker is quoted by the former Congressman, as follows:

I wonder if the advocates of the plan ever considered the possibility that European purchasers of ammunition might refuse payment, if ammunition contracts were unfulfilled, and the effect on the banks that have loaned money and the attendant train of bankruptcy and ruin and unemployment that would follow in the wake.

EFFECT OF MUNITION SALES IN GERMANY

Again we are asked to go into the munitions game in order that we can have profit. Of course, those munitions are to kill—kill people with whom we are at war? No; to kill people with whom we are at peace. Do not think that that would not cause bitterness. Did it cause bitterness in the World War? Let me read three letters to show what resulted. The first was written in December 1914 by Ambassador Gerard:

The Germans are a little irritated just now at our sales of munitions to the Allies.

This was the case according to Ambassador Gerard. Remember in December they were a little irritated. But on February 15, 1915, he wrote:

The feeling as I said just now is very tense against America. The sale of arms is at the bottom and the fact that we stand things from England that we would not from Germany is the cause.

In March of that year Colonel House was in Berlin, and he discussed the munitions traffic. He told about the bitterness that existed in Germany against the United States, and said:

This is almost wholly due to our selling munitions of war to the Allies. The bitterness of their resentment toward us for this is almost beyond belief. It seems that every German that is being killed or wounded is being killed or wounded by an American rifle, bullet, or shell.

Hartley Grattan, in his new book *Deadly Parallel*, says:

The American munitions traffic with the Allies during the first World War contributed a vast deal to the embitterment of German-American relations, as can be discovered by reading the despatches from Germany of Ambassador Gerard. Further, it vividly dramatizes the aid this country is giving the side purchasing arms, for in a war the average man sees very clearly that guns are immensely useful, though he may miss the vast importance of a cargo of steel rails. The fact that American guns are sold to Britain and France will strengthen popular sympathy for their cause. The temperature of partisanship will rise. American unneutrality will certainly be increased by the repeal of the embargo on arms in favor of a cash-and-carry policy. The change will be of tremendous importance, because it will mark the beginning of the collapse of American neutrality. The deed is on the heads of Franklin Roosevelt and his followers. Retreat on this point will surely be used to force retreat all along the line until every defense built up has been knocked down.

We are today stimulating a bitterness that might cause an incident to plunge us into war. We are stimulating the bitterness in starting the sale of munitions to Europe; and that bitterness may rise to the point where an incident might occur. In a letter from General von Falkenhayn to Bethmann-Hollweg, in discussing unrestricted warfare:

So far as this submarine situation is concerned, America's step from the secret war in which it has long been engaged against us to an openly declared hostility can effect no change.

They had developed bitterness because of the munitions trade, and that bitterness caused incidents which plunged us into war. Of course we went to war directly on the ground of the sinking of our ships. But why were those ships sunk? Was it that Germany felt that we were not neutral; that we were helping England to destroy her, and she sank those ships just as any other nation would sink them when its back was against the wall, and it felt that one side was helping the other side? We caused the development of bitterness in Europe; munitions trade makes bitterness which easily might result in war.

MUNITIONS TRADE IMMORAL

I feel that the sale of arms and munitions and implements of war is immoral in time of war or in time of peace. I feel that America should not become a merchant of death.

Furthermore, I realize that if we should go into this war—and God forbid that we should—we would not be fighting for liberty, but would be fighting purely for a balance of power in Europe, though, of course, our soldiers would be told that they were fighting for liberty. Sir Phillip Gibbs in his book about the World War soldiers said this:

They had been told that they were fighting for liberty. But their first lesson was the utter loss of individual liberty under a discipline which made the private soldier no more than a number. They were ordered about like galley slaves, herded about like cattle. Was it not rather that the masses of men engaged in slaughter were serving the purpose of powers above them, rival powers, greedy for one another's markets, covetous of one another's wealth, and callous of the lives of humble men? Surely if the leaders of the warring nations were put together for even a week in some such place as Hooze, or the Hohenzollern redoubt, afflicted by the usual harassing fire, poison gas, mine explosions, lice, rats, and the stench of rotting corpses, with the certainty of death or dismemberment at the week end, they would settle the business and come to terms before the week was out. I heard that proposition put forward many times by young officers of ours, and as an argument against their own sacrifice they found it unanswerable.

Mr. President, do you think that the rulers of Europe today would go to war if they had to do the fighting? No; they would go to the basement, just as the House of Lords did. Oh, no; they are not going to die. They are going to stand back and tell the others how to win the war.

Some have high hopes of war. Men have hoped to gain many things by war—power and wealth for themselves, glory and honor for their country, and freedom and happiness for mankind. All they have succeeded in getting, to quote an eighteenth century wit, are "widows, taxes, wooden legs, and death."

One of the great tragedies of war is that it is fought, not by bad men knowing themselves to be bad but by good men passionately convinced that they are right. War is not fought by men who feel that they are wrong. It is fought by men who feel that they are right. The history of war shows that it brings dictators. Dictators bring despotism, and with despotism liberty is lost. As part of the chain of conflict comes the loss of civil rights.

Let us weigh war in its true light. We see beautiful buildings, architectural gems, homes of civilized people destroyed. We see the maimed, mutilated, and mangled moaning and begging for their existence, for the right to live, or the pleasure of death to get away from their pains.

We see men with their arms and legs gone, torn away by shrapnel. We see men with part of their faces gone. We see men lying on the battlefield, silent, never to speak again. In place of smiles we see agony. In place of peace and happiness we see war and sorrow—and we will help to bring it about. When we send the gun to kill we help to tear the head off the son of some mother.

Oh, you can hide and try to close your conscience if you will; but my conscience will not bother me when I see a gruesome, horrible war scene of death. I can rest secure in the thought that that death was not contributed to by munitions which I voted to send across the Atlantic. That is what you are doing. You are voting to get in the game of death in order that profit might be made.

Of course we are not yet in the war, but the path is so tragically marked with a parallel that I am afraid we shall be in it.

I recall distinctly that 25 years ago my father opposed the World War. I recall how he told the people of my home city that we were on the way to war. I realized the punishment and the bitterness visited upon him because of his desire to keep America at peace. Those things were indelibly impressed upon me as a child. I remember that some of the very men whom he tried to keep out of the front-line trenches were the ones who condemned him with the greatest bitterness. But he was right. He was in the minority, but he was right.

What pleasure, what joy, will you have when you know that a gun sent by you as an accessory to the fact helped to kill some young man in Europe? It will kill someone. What satisfaction will you have when you think of mothers and sisters back in the home weeping at the death of some boy killed by a bullet you helped to send to France? You can hide your conscience if you will, but you will never be able to erase the fact that you contributed to it. You cannot erase the fact that by this method we are sending shells across the Atlantic, not to stop Hitler. Hitler will not be touched by a single shot. "Some boy—many boys—will be stopped by the shots that we send across."

We are not sending bombers across the ocean to bomb Hitler. We are sending them to drop missiles on soldiers—yes; not alone soldiers, but women and children just like your wife and just like your child. You may hide behind the excuse that others will sell munitions if we do not; but you cannot cover up the fact that you are an accessory to sending munitions across the ocean. You may say others are killing, but deep down in your heart you know that when you vote to lift the embargo you are voting to contribute to the toll of death in Europe. When you pick up a newspaper and see a gruesome, terrible scene of a soldier with his head half gone, just remember that his head may have been torn off by an American bullet which you voted to send. When you see a picture of a little child resting in death after a terrible bombing raid, remember that that bomb may have been an American bomb that you voted to send across the Atlantic. You cannot excuse your action because Germany may be killing them. What right have we, in peace, to contribute to the continuation of war?

What are shells, arms, and ammunition used for? To kill; not to kill citizens of a country which is at war with us, but to kill citizens of a country at peace with us. Let me say again that not one bomb will strike Hitler. We shall not smash Hitler with the munitions we send across. We shall smash the boys of Germany, who feel that they are fighting for the right, even though we know they are in the wrong. Those bombs and shells are not for the men who made the war; they are for the men who fight the war. We can sit back and say that that is not our affair; but you know, and we all know, and any man with a conscience knows, that when you put a gun in a man's hand and that gun brings death you cannot sit back and say, "I had nothing to do with that death."

Yes; Hitler may be stopped. The Kaiser was stopped. Hundreds of thousands of boys died in stopping him. They were stopped on the battlefields of France; and the Kaiser was not touched by a bullet. The Kaiser will die in a bed in Holland.

No; when we talk about smashing Hitler, all the smashing of Hitler will be of no avail until the conditions in Europe which created Hitler are corrected.

Hitler is a symbol in this war, just as the Kaiser was a symbol in the last war. We cannot correct the condition by adding fuel to the fire. We cannot correct it by sending across the ocean guns, arms, and munitions to kill.

Others may do as they please, but no boy in any foreign country will die coughing out his lungs with poison gas which I voted to send across the water.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I happen to have before me a copy of today's Washington News. In looking over the headlines I find one that I am sure will be of interest to the Senator, since he has been speaking very eloquently of the destruction of war and its frightful results.

This is 20 years and more after the close of the last war. Incidentally, in that connection, I am reminded that about 4 weeks ago I was in Havre, France; and there I saw, rearing itself to the skies, a great granite monument upon which was carved "1914-1918," meaning that from then on the people of France expected eternal peace. At that time war had been declared. I was there a few days after war had been declared; and I was reminded of the fact that although the last war had been ended more than 20 years, today we, in the United States, have not been able to furnish sufficient hospital space to provide hospitalization for many thousands of American heroes who were affected as a result of their participation in that war.

I bring this article to the attention of the Senator. It reads:

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND WAR VETERANS HAVE NOT APPLIED FOR BONUSES, POST FUNDS

Some 150,000 World War veterans never have applied for their bonuses, according to records compiled by Father Francis J. Hurney Post No. 112, Catholic War Veterans.

The total includes 60,000 who have never applied for certificates, 15,000 who have less than \$50 due them, 65,000 dependents of deceased veterans entitled to quarterly benefits, and 10,000 dependents entitled to less than \$50.

Anyone in any of these classifications is asked to write Post Welfare Officer Francis J. Parduyn at 323 Farragut Street NW.

Think of it, Mr. President! Twenty years after the war we are unable to provide hospitalization for all the American heroes who participated in that great struggle, and now we are told that more than 150,000 have never applied for certain compensation to which they are entitled for service during the World War.

Mr. President, while the Senator from West Virginia is good enough to bear with me at this time, let me say I recall that a moment ago, just before I was called from the Senate Chamber to talk to some of my North Carolina friends, I heard him remark something about saving the world for democracy and about the embargo.

I wish to say to the Senator that since this discussion began I have found myself in cotton fields in North Carolina, since we North Carolinians are very desirous of selling cotton to whomsoever might buy it; that I have visited through many tobacco fields, and I have been through a number of the great industrial and manufacturing plants which are producing commodities which we would like to sell to nations across the sea, and particularly to those at war, I judge, from what has been said. But after hearing these debates, I see before me a danger sign. I saw none in the cotton fields; I noted none in the tobacco fields; I observed none in the great industrial plants, but I do see a danger sign bearing the words "Beware munitions." That perhaps may be a false sign; I do not know as to that; none of us know, but there is a question in my mind whether I should disregard that sign and take the path to the right or to the left to avoid any danger. I do not know; I have not made up my mind definitely in regard to that matter. However, that is neither here nor there at this particular time.

The Senator said a moment ago that the World War was fought for the purpose of saving democracy, of aiding Christianity, of stopping war for all time. May I at this time bring to the Senator's attention—although I know he is thoroughly familiar with it—the fact that since the ending of the last war on Armistice Day, November 11, 1918, as for aiding Christianity, there have been more assaults upon it than during almost any other period of a quarter of a century in the history of the world. As the Senator will recall, millions of Christians were murdered by starvation in the Russian Ukraine in 1933 and 1934.

In connection with that statement I recall that not many months ago our Ambassador to France, Mr. Bullitt, was in Washington and testified before a joint committee consisting

of the Military Affairs Committees of the House and the Senate. I knew that he had been our representative at Moscow for some time, that he was thoroughly familiar with the matter, and I made direct inquiry of him then as to whether or not it was true that millions of Christians resident in that particular portion of Soviet Russia had been murdered by starvation. He said, yes; that was quite true.

The Senator from West Virginia will recall the assault made on Christianity and Christian people and leaders of the faith in Spain at the time there was a struggle for supremacy in that Christian land between the Fascists and the Communists. We know, of course, that more temples of worship and religion have been razed to the ground and burned and destroyed than ever before within a 25-year period, and certainly within our recollection.

Now, as for saving democracy, I know there have been tremendous assaults made upon democracy, and such assaults have been made particularly in this country. Why? Because the American people have been "asleep at the switch." Night and day for many months some who are supposedly Americans have been working like termites in the endeavor to destroy the democracy of the United States of America while the great masses of the American people have been asleep and permitted it to go on.

As I mentioned to the Senator a moment ago, the Dies Committee uncovered, by sworn testimony, facts showing that there are today, 2,800 Communists holding fine positions in the Government of the United States of America. I venture to say that many of those who are endeavoring, both night and day, to destroy our American democracy, which is different from that of any other nation of the world, are aliens who arrived here illegally and have remained illegally or arrived legally and have remained illegally. The very reason it has been necessary to put on additional hundreds of men in the Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Justice to seek out spies, the very reason that great organizations in the United States of America have had to go to the expense of employing thousands of additional watchmen and patrolmen to guard their property against destruction and sabotage is, unfortunately, that we do not know who or where these alien enemies are. Why? Because the present Congress and others heretofore have failed and refused to pass a law requiring every alien within the confines of the United States of America to be fingerprinted and registered. If today every alien in the United States were fingerprinted and registered, we would know where these alien enemies are, and where they are working, with the purpose of destroying our Government.

We have been derelict in our duty in that respect and also because we have failed adequately to enforce our immigration law so as to keep out undesirable enemies of American democracy, enemies of the American form of government. If an effective law of the kind to which I have referred had been passed, today innumerable industrial organizations and great transportation companies would not have been put to the expense of employing thousands upon thousands of extra men, patrolmen and watchmen, to guard their property. The situation is a shame and a disgrace.

As the Senator stated awhile ago our danger is from within and not from without. One criticism I have to make is that the American people have been "asleep at the switch." We are spending billions of dollars for national defense—and I have voted for every one of those appropriations because I believe in an adequate national defense—we are spending billions of dollars to defend ourselves against the enemy from without, not one cent, comparatively speaking, to defend ourselves against the enemy within, who is boring night and day.

There is, indeed, as the Senator has pointed out, much more danger to be feared from the enemy within than from the enemy without, because we, with our airplanes, piloted by men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, if we were attacked by an enemy from without it would not be difficult for them to locate and turn back the enemy, for we have the finest airplanes in the world. We need ten, twenty, or

thirty thousand more; but we have the finest pilots upon the face of the earth.

It is different when it comes to locating enemies within. They work secretly, underhandedly, in the dark; their organizations are widespread; and the Attorney General himself and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover both stated that the land was honeycombed with spies.

I observed in the columns of the press only a day or two ago that the destruction in part of one of our ships—I believe it was out at San Diego, Calif.—was being investigated, and the investigation thus far revealed that the work was done by saboteurs. So what we must do is to put ourselves right in this country. Let us prepare an adequate national defense, one that cannot be penetrated by the army of any other country on the face of the earth; and in doing that, in fortifying ourselves against the assaults of the enemy from without, let us first clean house in this country. Let us purge this country. Before it is too late, let us get hold of these alien enemies, these undesirables, these aliens who are endeavoring to destroy our form of government, and send them back to the countries whence they came, and make those countries take them back. It can be done.

I thank the Senator.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I hesitate to trespass on the able address being made by the Senator from West Virginia; but, if I may have the attention of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] for a moment, he referred to the cotton situation. There seems to be an implication that exports of cotton are aided and increased during wartime.

The other day I had the Congressional Library make up a tabulation for me in that connection. Unfortunately, I have not the figures at hand, but I intend shortly to put them in the RECORD. If that tabulation is correct, after the outbreak of the World War in 1914, for 3 years, exportations of cotton dropped approximately two-thirds. Is the Senator from North Carolina aware that our cotton exports in 1914 dropped far below those in 1913, and in 1915 our cotton exports dropped to approximately one-third of those of 1913? I am merely using approximations now, and will supply the figures later. It was not until we practically got into the war, in 1917, that cotton exports again picked up.

Not only that, but the same thing was true of many other basic commodities, with the exception of tobacco, I believe, and of medicine, and of oil. Of course it is almost a matter of reason. A workman in England, for instance, going about his daily chores, uses a good deal of cotton. He probably has cotton trousers, cotton shirts, cotton gloves, and cotton socks. The minute he becomes a soldier, all those articles of clothing are made of wool.

It is rather amazing to me, in view of the statistics I have had compiled, that some persons from the Southern States seem to think a European war would aid the export of cotton, when the facts of the last war apparently are that not only did it curtail cotton exports, but it reduced them approximately two-thirds.

I was wondering if the Senator from North Carolina has been familiar with that situation.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me right along the same line that the Senator from Idaho has been discussing?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAVEZ in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOLT. I yield first to the Senator from Missouri, and then to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I simply wish to put an addendum to the question of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK]; and it applies not only to cotton from the Southern States,

but to beef and similar products from some of our Western States.

Does the Senator realize that at the present time, and for some time past, Great Britain has been buying its beef from the Argentine? Great Britain does not buy beef from us. Some people from some Western States seem to think the war is going to bring about a great increase in our exports of meat products to Great Britain. England buys its beef from the Argentine, and wants to buy its cartridges and TNT from us.

Mr. HOLT. I want to ask at that point—then I will yield to the Senator from North Carolina—how can England be blamed for buying beef from the Argentine when our own United States Army and Navy do so? [Laughter.]

I now yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Idaho that my recollection is that our export of cotton from the South did decline immediately after the beginning of the World War. As a matter of fact, I am not so sure that we shall greatly profit by this war insofar as the exportation of cotton is concerned, for the reason that if we require cash on delivery, with the transfer of title when the commodity is loaded in British or French bottoms, that cash, perhaps, will be long in coming. Those countries will not be possessed of a sufficient amount of cash to satisfy us in making those cash payments. As the result thereof, what will Great Britain do, and what will France do? Great Britain will buy her cotton from India. She will use the long-staple cotton from Egypt.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. And save her foreign exchange for the purchase of munitions in this country.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well, I do not know about that. Anyway, she will get her cotton from India. She will get her cotton from Egypt. She will get some of her cotton from China. As a matter of fact, if she can buy it cheaper, and she has to pay cash for it, she will get her cotton from Brazil, because down in Brazil now the English are vying with the Americans in regard to getting the Brazilian trade; and down in Brazil today the planters, many of whom have found cotton so profitable in production that they have destroyed many of their old coffee plantations and have converted them into cotton plantations, can produce cotton for 5 cents a pound and make a profit thereupon sufficient for them, in comparison with the losses they sustained upon the production of coffee. They probably will buy from Brazil, because the English have many millions of dollars invested in Brazil in the transportation and the public-utility business.

It is quite true, as the Senator from Missouri stated a moment ago, that the Argentine chiefly produces beef, and the British buy Argentine beef. That is perfectly natural, because the British have more money invested in the Argentine than any other nation upon the face of the earth has invested there; and the people of Buenos Aires, the capital thereof, who do their trading upon foreign shores, do not come to the United States of America for the purpose of doing it, but they go to London or Liverpool or Paris.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator briefly yield to me?

Mr. HOLT. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Let me point out the fact that if the arms embargo is repealed, Britain will have so much money to spend in the United States. Very obviously she will not use her dollar exchange to buy here anything that she can buy within her own empire with sterling exchange. That is perfectly patent. That means that she will get all the wheat she can get, and all she needs, from Canada.

Mr. REYNOLDS. And Australia.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. And Australia.

Mr. REYNOLDS. And New Zealand.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. She will get the wool she needs from Australia, and the cotton she needs from India and Egypt. It means that she will save and hoard her dollar exchange for the one thing she can get here that she cannot get elsewhere; namely, munitions.

So if any producers of raw materials in this country think Britain and France are going to use up their precious dollar

exchange in buying American wheat and American cotton and American wool and those things, it seems to me on the face of the matter that they are very patently mistaken. Frankly, I think it would be well in order if an amendment were proposed to this joint resolution to require that for every dollar of exchange used to buy munitions and instruments of death in this country a proportion of a dollar, or perhaps more dollars, should be used to buy raw products and other peacetime goods in this country.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I may add in that connection that I am somewhat afraid that the corn producers of Illinois and Iowa—which, I believe, are two of the great corn-producing States in this country—and some of our western producers of wheat, and our cotton producers of the South, and the tobacco producers of North Carolina, Virginia, and Georgia, are going to be disappointed. A number of our people unfortunately have been led to believe that we are going to be able to enrich ourselves overnight. I would that it were possible that my friends the farmers of North Carolina could get 20 and 25 cents a pound for their cotton; that my friends in Piedmont North Carolina, and up in the mountain section from which I come, could get 40 and 50 cents a pound for their tobacco; but I am, indeed, afraid they are going to be disappointed, because, as the able junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] so aptly pointed out, all the cash that France and Great Britain have they are going to use where they are forced to use it, and they are going to have to buy very little aside from munitions in this country. A large portion of northern Africa, controlled by them, produces cotton.

For instance, the little section known as Uganda has increased its cotton production about 75 percent within the past 2 years. All of those sections of Africa that are controlled by the British will supply them with cotton, together with India and perhaps China, whereas they will get their beef from the Argentine, and they probably will buy some cotton from Brazil; and, as the able Senator just stated, they will get their wool from New Zealand and Tasmania and Australia and a number of small islands in that section of the world that are noted for their fine production of wool.

Mr. HOLT. Where are they going to get the wool to pull over our eyes? [Laughter.] They have pulled it for a long while.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think that wool was pulled over our eyes on the 6th day of April 1917, when we entered the war, insofar as that is concerned. That reminds me of the fact that France and England, who pulled the wool over our eyes, have been able to keep the blinders on them up to the present time, and those blinders are weighted in gold to the extent of more than \$15,900,000,000.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I hope that when the Senator is speaking of tobacco he will not forget Kentucky. [Laughter.]

Mr. REYNOLDS. I forgot Kentucky in commenting on tobacco. I see that the able junior Senator from the great Commonwealth of Kentucky is on the lookout for the interests of his State, which produces one of the finest tobaccos upon the face of the earth, and the tobacco of Kentucky is used in the manufacture of cigarettes which are manufactured in the greatest State in the Union, namely, North Carolina. [Laughter.]

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for yielding to me.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. When we speak of cotton, and the sources of the supply of cotton, it would be well to remember Turkey in that connection. When we began to plow under cotton, Turkey began to plant and raise cotton and build textile factories. Missionaries who have lived in Turkey for more than 40 years, and who have traveled through this city, have given me very interesting information on that point.

I will ask the Senator whether we did not pass a bill some time ago providing for the exchange of some hundreds of thousands of bales of cotton for rubber from the British Empire. Am I correct in that?

Mr. HOLT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUNDEEN. It was my belief at that time that we should have received the rubber, and should have applied the value of the rubber on the debt Great Britain owes us. We would have gained something for the United States, instead of turning everything over to the British under that agreement. There are other resources which are abundant in the British Empire which they should furnish us and apply to the payment of the debt. I think the Senator will agree with me as to that.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Senator. I desire to say something about a statement of the Senator from North Carolina which I consider very important. Our task to preserve democracy is right here in the United States, not across the seas. Our task is to keep the torch of liberty lighted here, not over there.

We may be fooled and go over to keep the torch of liberty lighted there and come back and find it extinguished in the United States. The torch that we must keep alight is the torch of opportunity, and if the United States Senate and the House of Representatives when in session would spend as much time in trying to settle the problem of unemployment as in trying to help England by repealing the arms embargo, we would make a greater contribution to democracy than anything else we might do in connection with any neutrality bill.

HOPE OF DEMOCRACY HERE

The hope of democracy in the world is here, with men working in the mills. Our hope is not in giving the unemployed idle of America jobs in the uniforms of soldiers in France. Our job is to give American boys jobs in a factory producing, not implements to kill, but implements with which to build. Let us build homes in the United States with the idle labor that is here, instead of erecting munitions factories for the manufacture of things with which to destroy homes, no matter where those homes may be.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wish to say that I agree a hundred percent with the statement just made by the Senator. I contend that we ought to mobilize in the United States against the unemployment and poverty here instead of contemplating a mobilization for the purpose of sending the sons of American mothers to save something across the seas.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must admonish the occupants of the galleries that they are guests of the Senate. There is a rule of the Senate that there must be no manifestations of approval or disapproval in the galleries. Our guests will kindly obey that rule.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, our departments are now getting ready for an M day, for an army of men to go out in world conflict. As the Senator from North Carolina has said, let us get busy for an M day here, and wipe out unemployment. We are not going to do it through the munitions trade, we are not going to build our prosperity in Europe. We can build our prosperity here in the United States where the opportunities have always been given to build it.

"Make the world safe for democracy," and while we are making the world safe for democracy in Europe we are making it safe for poverty over here, we are making it safe for unemployment. If we would think as much about the hovels in the cities and the hunger throughout the United States as we do about the atrocities in Europe, instead of paying attention to things across the sea, we would be doing our duty. There are atrocities here, atrocities of hunger in the United States. Let us take care of them, first, before we start a trip across the ocean.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I desire to thank the Senator for the statement he has just made. We are becoming engaged and

involved in debate about continents across the ocean, about problems across the seven seas, about great issues and conflicts thousands of miles away; but I do not hear much if anything said about the United States and the problems under our own flag, about the destitute and hungry, and the poverty-stricken and the tax-ridden people of the United States, whose backs are bending under the burdens we are placing upon them due to the enormously increased armaments and the contemplation of war, and the burdens of the last war. I think the Senator should be commended for his attention to these vital problems, which must be solved if we would avoid danger of conflict from within our own borders, where we may have a frontier which we will have to take care of. If we would take care of the unemployed here, if we would take care of the housing problem, if we would take care of the farmers of the United States, and think of America, we would have no problem under our own flag that would be serious.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I was recently informed that a man very close to the administration said: "It is very important that we keep the people interested in Europe, because if we can keep them interested in Europe, they will not be thinking much about America."

The danger is that as long as we keep them looking out the back window, and keep saying, "There is a bogeyman who will get you there," they are not going to worry about their supper. While we are watching affairs across the seas, the unemployed are still without jobs. We still have one-third of the Nation ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clad. We have those conditions here, not in Europe, and if we would devote our energy and effort to protecting the United States, on this side of the ocean, we would contribute to democracy in the world.

We are challenging democracy by not allowing it to continue to work here. That is why there is danger to democracy, and danger, as the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Minnesota have said, from within this country. Men die for countries which protect them and protect their families. I do not want to take the time of the Senate much longer but I wish to read a letter in which it is stated:

We owe to the Allies whatever moral support and financial assistance it is in the power of this Nation to give; it is not merely the so-called American right that our munition makers should be free to sell to the enemies of Germany—it is our duty to encourage them to do so. Let us enthusiastically approve supplying the enemies of Germany with financial aid and munitions of war and resist with all our moral strength those who would place an embargo on munitions.

That letter was not written in 1939, but was written by Josiah Royce, a professor of Harvard University, on the 30th day of January 1916, when we were sliding into war. It could be used again today just the same as it was then. There are college professors telling us the same thing today. All we would have to do with that letter in order to put it into effect would be to put a 1939 date line on it instead of the 1916 date line.

The arms embargo is to be repealed because, first, it is said we should help France and England, and therefore save democracy again; and, second, because it will make profit. We will find that England and France are not interested in saving democracy, and, furthermore, we know that what we get will be fool's gold, which was spoken of in Chautauqua, N. Y., in 1936. Why the repeal of the arms embargo? Because of entanglements in the embroilments of Europe. Do we have to go through with the bargain? Is that why we are going to repeal the arms embargo? History will prove it. We will find that things done today will be exposed 20 years from now, just as things done 20 years ago are being exposed today.

Mr. President, others may do as they care to do, but so long as I have a vote in the United States Senate that vote will not be a vote to send guns across the sea to kill young men who want to live as ardently as I want to live. My vote in the United States Senate will not be for an act which will send shells across the sea with which to inflict wounds on men from which they will never recover. I do not want to send over anything which will injure young men

who wish to live and be healthy and happy just as I do. Would I not have resentment if I knew that a bullet shipped from a foreign country had killed my brother?

It is now proposed that we send such things across the sea and we will be doing so in the name of peace. Can any one say that we are doing it in the name of peace? Men do not kill in the name of peace, nor do men help others to kill in the name of peace. We are not doing this in the name of peace. We are doing it because of foreign embroilments.

Oh, I wish that the day before we vote on this measure every Senator could visit a veterans' hospital and see some of the shell-shocked soldiers, many of whom are mentally dead, even though they are still alive. I wish they could see them before they say, "I shall vote to make more of those shell-shocked veterans in Europe." That is what they will do if they vote to repeal the arms embargo. They will be accessories to the killing of every man who falls in France or Germany as a result of the explosion of an American shell when they vote to send munitions across the sea. They may escape condemnation, but they cannot escape their consciences.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAVEZ in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Are not guns and ammunition now being sent from the United States under the present law, and are not men now being killed in the war in Europe by arms which were shipped from the United States under the present policy?

Mr. HOLT. Not that I know of; but if I had my way, as I have said, I would outlaw the sale of arms and ammunition to any country in time of peace or in time of war. Simply because one wrong is being committed, the situation will not be made right by committing two wrongs.

Oh, yes; men will die on the battlefield, men will be killed, with the blood gushing from their heads as the result of the explosion of shells sent across the sea from the United States of America, with the words "United States of America" marked on them. Other Senators may do that, if they please, in the name of democracy, but my conscience will be clear. I shall not contribute to it. This is an issue which affects the emotions. It affects American homes. But my vote will not be a vote for death; it will be a vote for peace, for I intend to vote to continue the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war. [Applause in the galleries.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is a little earlier than our usual hour for recess, but by the time a quorum is obtained and another Senator is recognized for a speech it would be time to recess for the day. So I shall move a recess at this time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. SMEDLEY D. BUTLER

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Recently I had the pleasure of sitting in the broadcasting room of the Mutual Broadcasting System listening to a 15-minute broadcast by one of the most distinguished soldiers that ever wore the uniform of the United States, Maj. Gen. Smedley D. Butler, of the United States Marine Corps, retired, the only man in the history of American Armies who has ever possessed the equivalent of three Congressional Medals of Honor. I think there is no military man in the world better qualified to estimate the possibilities or probabilities of an attack on the United States than General Butler, and I ask that his remarks be inserted in the Record at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

My fellow Americans, let's look at this European war. Let's see if we should be all hot and bothered over it. Did we have anything to do with getting it up? You know we didn't, and I know we didn't. And I'll tell you why.

We didn't have one single, solitary thing to do with any of the crooked, back-alley maneuvering that brought this war into existence.

We weren't present at its birth. We weren't consulted about the doctor. We didn't even meet the nurse.

Now, that being the case, are we going to be dumb enough to let them leave it on our doorstep? Are we going to let them say:

"Here it is. It's yours, too. And you feed it."

There may be a lot of shooting going on over in Europe, but there's an awful lot of sound and fury going on over here.

Don't let them kid us. Keep your eye on one thing.

The way to get into this war is to raise the embargo on arms.

Remember that one thing. It's the heart and soul of the matter. If you want to be dragged in, just start selling arms and munitions.

Nations are like people, you know. Some try to lead honorable lives. Some are untrustworthy. Some are like rats.

But what would you say if a couple of fellows started a terrific scrap down the street, and somebody came running up to you and said:

"Want to get into that scrap?"

You'd say, "No. It isn't my scrap. I want to be neutral."

And then this well-meaning guy would say:

"Swell. Here's a pile of rocks, brickbats, and clubs. Hand them out to one of those sluggers, or even both of them. That's the way to keep neutral."

Now, in the case of the scrap down the street, what would you think if anybody gave you that kind of advice?

I don't even have to tell you.

Now, getting back to the mess on the other side of the Atlantic, here's one of the ways they're using to try to drag us in.

They say: Well, if the British and the French don't lick Hitler, Hitler will be over here and on our necks.

He'll be bombing our women and children and shelling our cities.

Don't let anybody feed you that misinformation.

It doesn't take a military education to figure out what I'm going to tell you.

It will take not less than 1,000,000 soldiers to invade the United States with any hope of even getting ashore.

These million men must come all at once.

They must bring not less than 7 tons of baggage per man—1,000,000 men, 7,000,000 tons of food, ammunition, and what not.

They must bring 400,000 motor vehicles. They've got to find room for 50 gallons of gasoline per day for each vehicle for 270 days—that's 9 months' supply.

Why, there are not enough ships in the whole world to carry that kind of an expedition. And, remember, those ships have to have enough fuel to get back with—to make the round trip.

Any dumb cluck can see that.

But here's some more—they've got to have harbors to land in, docks to get their stores ashore. You know you can't stop 25 miles out at sea, drop a 5-ton armored tank overboard, and tell it to swim ashore and meet you on Broadway.

You know very well we're not going to open our harbors to them, prepare docks for them, and invite them in.

New York Harbor is the only big one we have on this coast, and to block New York Harbor all you have to do is to dump 2 days' garbage in the channel instead of hauling it out to sea.

And don't forget that we happen to have a Navy, and it's the best in the world.

Now, what about an aerial invasion?

Well, Colonel Lindbergh and Eddie Rickenbacker, the two foremost fliers we have, already have told you it's ridiculous to talk or to think about bombing New York from Berlin.

And don't forget that we have an air force of our own.

So, my fellow Americans, let's take one thing at a time.

This war's in Europe. It isn't over here. And it won't come over here unless we invite it. But the way to invite it is to sell bombs and munitions. They'll have the stamp of American makers on them, and they'll have the R. S. V. P. that'll bring about acceptance of that invitation. An invitation to go over there and join in the mess. Oh, but the bogey boo is that somebody will come over here.

Don't you be alarmed. Nobody in Europe can afford to leave home. Why, if Hitler leaves Germany with a million soldiers to come over here, if he ever got back he'd find everybody speaking either French or Russian. Those babies would move in on him while he was gone.

No; there isn't a single crazy war dog that can come over here. We can build a defense of our own country that not even a rat, let alone a mad dog, could creep through.

But let's be consistent. We cry to high heaven that we are a Christian and a peace-loving Nation. We don't believe in shooting people, bombing their homes, knocking down their cities with cannon. We really are a Christian, peace-loving people, but I say to you it's un-Christian, hypocritical, and unmanly to say to the British and the French, "Sure, we're against this fellow Hitler, but, being Christian and peace-loving, we can't shoot him; we can't bomb him, but we'll be delighted to see you do it, and we'll furnish the guns and the bombs; that is providing you pay us double what they're worth. And in order there may be no mistake this time, you'll pay in advance."

"You see, we're against our going to war, but we're not against your wars. You go ahead. We'll sell you the stuff."

Make no mistake about it. We've got to answer the big question, and here it is:

How often are we going over there to bail out Europe? Will we have to do it every 25 years? In addition to sending our children

today, are we going to be ready to send our grandchildren 25 years from now?

Are we so much interested right now that we want to contribute 5,000,000 of the finest and the strongest boys that the great mothers of America have produced?

Are you mothers and fathers so deeply interested that you want to furnish your sons?

Well, start selling ammunition and that's what you'll have to do. Don't you realize the money you get for your ammunition will be covered with blood? And, as time goes on, this blood will be the blood of your own children.

Has blood money ever brought anything but misery to those who got the money?

Look what happened to the billions of dollars we made out of the last war.

It brought us a situation where even today, 20 years later, there are 10,000,000 of us out of work.

And if we allow ourselves to handle any more of this stinking blood money, there'll be 20,000,000 of us out of work—maybe for the next 50 years.

But that isn't all. Let's go back to cases and look at this thing from a personal viewpoint.

It's all very well and high sounding to say that the Government declares war. To say we have nothing to do with it. We enter the war—but who are we? Well, "we" right now are the mothers and fathers of every able-bodied boy of military age in the United States. "We" are also you young men of voting age and over, that they'll use for cannon fodder.

Now, you mothers, particularly!

The only way you can resist all this war hysteria and beating of tom-toms is by asserting the love you bear your boys. When you listen to some well-worded, some well-delivered war speech, just remember it's nothing but sound. I tell you that no amount of sound can make up to you for the loss of your boy. After you've heard one of those speeches and your blood's all hot and you want to bite somebody like Hitler, go upstairs where your boy's asleep.

Go into his bedroom. You'll find him lying there, pillow all messed up, covers all tangled, sleeping away so hard. Look at him. Put your hand on that spot on the back of his neck—the place you used to love to kiss when he was a baby. Just rub it a little. You won't wake him up. Just look at his strong, fine young body because only the best boys are chosen for war. Look at this splendid young creature who's part of yourself, then close your eyes for a moment and I'll tell you what can happen.

You won't actually see it, but I have seen it, and I can describe it to you. You can easily imagine it.

But, first, you have a 50-50 chance of never seeing your boy again if you let this embargo on arms be raised and your boy is conscripted and sent overseas to fight.

If you ever do see him again, 50 times out of a hundred he'll be a maimed and helpless cripple all his life.

Why, you say, that can't happen. That wasn't true in the last war. But the last European war saw us fight just about 150 days and we had more than a quarter of a million casualties. Try to get out of this war inside of 150 days.

Now, get this picture of your boy while you're standing there in the dark of the bedroom where he's peacefully sleeping—trusting you.

That boy relies on you. You brought him into this world; you cared for him. Now I ask you, Are you going to run out on him? Are you going to let someone beat a drum or blow a bugle and make him run after it? Thank God, this is a democracy, and by your voice and your vote you can save your boy. You are the bosses of this country—you mothers, you fathers.

And now for that other picture I said I'd give you—that other picture that can be the picture of your boy:

Somewhere—5,000 miles from home. Night. Darkness. Cold. A drizzling rain. The noise is terrific. All hell has broken loose. A star shell bursts in the air. Its unearthly flare lights up the muddy field. There's a lot of tangled rusty barbed wires out there and a boy hanging over them—his stomach ripped out—and he's feebly calling for help and water. His lips are set tight. He's in agony.

There's your boy; the same boy lying in bed tonight; the same boy who trusts you. Do you want him to be the next Unknown Soldier? The last one had a mother and a father. He just didn't appear.

And listen, you mothers and fathers. I've had the heart-rending experience in my time of sitting with some of your sons as they've gone over. I've listened to the pathetic little last messages they've wanted carried back to you. I've accepted and delivered the poor little keepsakes they've wanted you to have.

Do you want your boy, tangled in barbed wire or struggling for a last gasp of breath in stinking trenches somewhere abroad—do you want him to cry out, "O mother, O father, why did you let them do it?"

Think it over, my dear fellow Americans. Think if all this is worth it.

Can't we be satisfied with defending our own homes, our own women, our own children?

There are only two reasons why you should ever be asked to give your youngsters.

One is the defense of our homes. The other is the defense of the Bill of Rights—and particularly the right to worship God as we see fit.

Every other reason advanced for the murder of our young men is a racket, pure and simple.

And yet, if you sit still and allow this thing to go on, if you allow this hysteria to mount, this propaganda to take hold of you; if you allow this embargo on arms to be raised; if you allow our national pockets to jingle with blood money, I tell you that you can prepare to say good-bye to your boy.

I beg you, don't let them do this. I beg of you to sit down this very minute and write a message to your Congressman and your Senator or to our President.

That's your right, your constitutional right of appeal. That's your privilege.

Keep this arms embargo on tight. They've been fighting for a thousand years in Europe—since the dawn of history, really. Don't let them dot those blood-drenched fields with the bodies of our American boys.

Good night.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, October 19, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, steal into our hearts like the rhythm of unearthly peace; perfect our trust and strengthen our power of faith. We rejoice that night reigns not in Thy universe; above the center of all power, all human sight, and sense, Thou art the eternal noon. As time's ceaseless river is set toward the deeps of the eternal sea, O, let the love of Christ purge away the leaven of strife and struggle; let them not stain the face of sincere appreciation. Lift us above empty moralities and inspire us with a life fresh in the spirit of brotherhood. Look down in mercy upon our beloved Speaker and the Congress; preserve them in mind and body. Blessed Lord, these walls echo with a nation's history. Today we look back to where statesmanship was born and abides. We render tribute to a son of genius who has gone the way that leads to the expanding view which finally brings us all to the splendor of a glorious dawn. In the name of our Elder Brother. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. CHANDLER, of Kentucky, as a member of the Joint Committee to Investigate the Adequacy and Use of Phosphate Resources of the United States, authorized by Public Resolution No. 112, Seventy-fifth Congress, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. M. M. Logan, late a Senator from the State of Kentucky.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the reading of the Journal and disposition of business on the Speaker's desk I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, at the request of my colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT], who is detained at home, I ask unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks and include therein a short funeral address delivered at the funeral of the late Senator Logan and a short editorial on the subject of Senator Logan's death.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks

by including an address made by the Honorable James A. Farley, Postmaster General of the United States, at the dedication of the North Beach Airport, New York City, on Sunday, October 15.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

THE ARGENTINE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, we listened yesterday to the very interesting remarks of our able colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], who discussed the proposed trade agreement with Argentina.

It is my belief that no Government policy is more ruinous to American agriculture and dairy interests and to the livestock growers than this policy of trade agreements with South America. The fact that hearings are now going on downtown illustrates the point I have tried to make before—that Congress ought to stay in session and that the responsible leadership of this House ought to bring in a bill and permit us to vote on it doing away with legislation that permits these reciprocal-trade agreements.

As I have said, hearings are now being conducted in connection with a proposed trade agreement with the Argentine. These hearings are important, but everyone realizes that the new dealers and experimenters have their minds already made up so that the protest that we make to the committee, which is conducting these hearings, will undoubtedly be ignored. The only effect that the reciprocal-trade agreements can have is to sell American agriculture down the river.

The policy of the new dealers is to curtail American agriculture and buy agricultural products from South America. I recall sometime ago the episode when beef was purchased from the Argentine instead of patronizing our cattle growers out West.

Minnesota is predominately an agricultural State. It is built on an agricultural foundation. Livestock and dairying contribute to its prosperity.

I have received, in today's mail, a communication from W. S. Moscrip, of St. Paul, emphasizing the unfairness of these reciprocal-trade agreements, and calling attention to the fact that they discriminate against our dairy and agricultural interests. I also have other protests against this proposed trade agreement. For example, the milk producers are directly affected, and if these trade agreements are to be continued in force and new ones made, it is only a question of time until South America will furnish our milk, butter, cheese, poultry, and other products of the farm.

Of course, as I have indicated, the New Deal policy is to make trade agreements, and at this time I simply call attention to the fact that they are all done at the expense of the dairy and agricultural interests, not only of Minnesota, but also of other States.

I might say that this question was an issue in the campaign of 1938, and I promised the people of the Eighth Congressional District, that I would raise my voice in opposition to the ruinous policy which the new dealers are carrying on against the farmers of the State of Minnesota. In their behalf, I protest this new trade agreement. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes at the conclusion of the other special orders today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a speech delivered by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson before the American Legion National Convention on September 27 last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial appearing in the Shelbyville Republican, of Shelbyville, Ind., on the 17th of October last.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein an article from the Christian Century on the subject of the poll tax.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a joint resolution of the Wisconsin Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to protect the domestic fox- and fur-raising industry.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein what purports to be the first prayer ever offered in the National Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

Mr. IGLESIAS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House heretofore made such time as may be required has been set aside to pay tribute to the life and public service of the late Thomas B. Reed, former Speaker of the House.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

THE LATE SPEAKER THOMAS BRACKETT REED

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. SMITH] may have permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a memorial address he delivered in the Maine Legislature in 1903 concerning Thomas Brackett Reed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks concerning former Speaker Reed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this day, the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Brackett Reed, has been set aside by the House for services to honor his memory. As a New Englander and one who occupies a position he so ably held, I am glad of the opportunity to pay tribute to this great son of Maine.

First, may I note Congressman OLIVER, of Portland, who represents the old Reed district, and Congressman BREWSTER, of Maine, are unable to be here because they are joining in a great demonstration in Portland, the city of his birth. Congressman CLYDE SMITH, of Maine, arrived here this morning to join in the services, but has contracted a heavy cold, which prevents his attendance.

I am sure that while none of the Members from Maine are here at this moment physically they are here in spirit.

Thomas Brackett Reed was a great American, an intellectual giant, and one of the ablest and most forceful figures ever to walk across the American political stage.

No man ever had a finer knowledge of parliamentary law than Tom Reed. His rules of procedure will be a guide wherever there is free speech and an orderly assembly of free men and women.

New England has contributed many great political leaders to the country. Reed, unlike the others, was distinctly a product of the House. Here in this famous Chamber he

served for 22 years. During most of this time he was either minority leader or Speaker.

He came first to the House in 1877, at a time when our country was emerging from the shadows of the unfortunate War between the States. A new spirit was coming into the country. It preached a unified patriotism; it was the spirit of courage, faith, and optimism. America was on the march. Its frontiers were being pushed rapidly westward. Expansion industrially, agriculturally, and commercially was in evidence everywhere. America was growing up and becoming a world empire. These new times and new conditions brought new problems and the man we honor today was for 22 years a dominating influence in American life.

It would not be possible to record all of the achievements of the notable man from Maine. The contribution of any Congressman to his country must chiefly be in the confines of the committee and conference rooms. This seldom makes it possible to record the most brilliant service. However, the merit and ability of a Member is quickly appraised by his associates.

That Tom Reed was an outstanding leader is eloquently indicated by his frequent election to positions of leadership and by the cold judgment of his fellow Members.

Speaker Champ Clark, a great Democrat and a great American, said of Reed at the time of his voluntary retirement, he was "far and away the most brilliant figure in American politics."

Former Senator James E. Watson, of Indiana, who served in the House with Reed, said in his memoirs:

Speaker Reed for a time was the most admired and most hated man in the country. This was because of his adoption of the so-called Reed rules. That act worked a revolution in the parliamentary procedure of the House.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] served as Parliamentarian under Speaker Clark, and I have in my hand a telegram which he sent, and I would like to read it:

Much regret cannot reach Washington in time to participate in commemorative ceremonies for Speaker Reed, perhaps the most eminent Speaker who ever presided in that position; and exercises most timely and appropriate.

CLARENCE CANNON, M. C.

These quotations reflect the sentiments of his colleagues. Reed twice was prominently mentioned for the Presidency. He was a candidate in 1892 and again in 1896, when he undoubtedly was the outstanding leader in the Republican Party. If he had come from any other State than rock-ribbed Republican Maine, he might have achieved the high office of President.

It is a fine custom which prompts this country to honor the men and women who have ably and constructively served their day and generation and passed on, leaving their footprints on the sands of time. This practice cannot fail to inspire us all to render more unselfish service to humanity.

A great American was born 100 years ago. He brilliantly served his country and passed on. May the name of Thomas Brackett Reed ever be written in letters of burning gold in the records of our country as an inspiration to the men and women who will come to this great people's forum with ardent hopes to be of service to America. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would not feel that I had done myself justice if I did not take an opportunity to say a word about the life and character of Thomas B. Reed. I was a mere boy when he was Speaker of this House, but I remember reading of him. I was always inspired when I read about Mr. Reed.

I think he was one of the boldest, one of the most fearless, and one of the ablest statesmen America ever produced. He came into power in the House of Representatives at a time and in the backwash, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] stated, of the great War between the States, when partisanship was pretty rife at times.

He inherited a code of rules, as did his great successor, Mr. Cannon. I have always admired Mr. Reed and Mr. Cannon for one thing especially, and that is they had the ability, they had the confidence in themselves to believe that they could exercise well all the power that went with the great office of Speaker under the rules of the House of Representatives.

When I used to look upon Mr. Cannon in this House, a man who in many ways was like Speaker Reed, I always thought that I looked upon a man with iron in his backbone and brains in his head.

I recall one time talking with Speaker Clark about the many men with whom he had served in the House of Representatives, and I asked him if he could name the man he considered the most brilliant one with whom he had ever served. He said, "I would rather name two than one. If I had to name the two biggest-brained men with whom I ever served I would name Reed, of Maine, and Bailey, of Texas." Mr. Bailey was minority leader in this House while Mr. Reed was the Speaker of the House.

Mr. Reed had a great life; he had a full life. If he had not been quite so sturdy, and if some politicians had not had in them fear of his being elevated to a higher and more powerful office, in my opinion, he would have been President of the United States. One incident that makes us know that he had a sharp tongue was his reply when he was asked at about that time if he thought he would be the Republican nominee for the President. He said:

They could go farther and do worse, and I think they will.

[Laughter.]

It is reported that when Mr. Reed sat where the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] is now sitting, an orator on the floor of the House one day in controversy with the Chair finally said:

Mr. Speaker, I would rather be right than be the Nation's President.

The Speaker said:

The gentleman need not worry; he will never be either.

[Laughter.]

These are characteristics of this great outstanding man, and to the men who followed him in the position of Speaker of this House he set a very high mark to aim at. In the many years it has been my privilege to serve in this House every man who has occupied that chair, whether he be a Republican or whether he be a Democrat, has measured up in fairness, in ability, and in patriotism to the high standard set by Speaker Reed and such men as he was. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER].

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, we commemorate today the centenary of the birth of a Speaker of the House of Representatives, the late Thomas Brackett Reed, of the State of Maine. In a very humble way I wish to add my tribute of respect and honor to the memory of one of the greatest Speakers who ever occupied that chair. All of our Speakers have been great men as well as good men. Without those qualifications, no man could be elected to that exalted office. At another time, some years ago, I took occasion to voice my judgment about the office of Speaker and the men who have occupied that chair, and I have never had any reason to revise my former opinion. In that address delivered on the floor 3 years ago I made the following statement, and I ask your indulgence while I repeat it:

In my humble opinion, the Speaker of this House holds in his credentials of election the supreme testimonial of exalted character, unimpeachable integrity, and superlative ability. He is no accident. He must prove his fitness for this great office through a long series of years in the fierce furnace of political debate, the fisticuff of parliamentary strategy and maneuver, and by his ability to manage strong and intelligent men under the most trying and difficult circumstances. That, in my opinion, was what led the beloved Nicholas Longworth to declare on this floor, "I would rather occupy that chair than any other office in the world."

Among the distinguished men who have occupied the chair no one ever transcended Hon. Thomas B. Reed in strength of character and ability. He was cast in heroic mold. He

was a giant in mind, soul, and body—a titanic figure in the intellectual, political, and physical world.

"The front of Jove himself,
An eye like Mars to threaten and command,
A combination and a form, indeed,
Where every god did seem to set his seal
To give the world assurance of a man."

Speaker Reed was a sincere man. He hated demagogues, and they often felt the sting of his wit and satire. He despised sham and hollow pretense. He loathed the theatrical in politics. He was no publicity hound. He was no poseur for popularity. For him no catering or fawning for applause.

He would not flatter Neptune for his trident,
Nor Jove for his power to thunder.

It was my fortune, or misfortune, if you like, to have been a constituent of Jerry Simpson during all of his congressional career. That was out in what is known as the Big Seventh which at that time had 36 counties within its boundaries. At the time of Simpson's first election I was a freshman in Iowa in the present district of our distinguished colleague, Mr. GWYNNE. Jerry Simpson's fame had preceded his election, for Victor Murdock, afterward a Member of the House, had fastened onto him for all time the sobriquet of "Sockless Socrates." Like most freshmen I talked too much, probably bragged a little about living in his district. At any rate I was soon known as Old Sockless, which soon degenerated into simple Old Socks. That stuck to me during all the 4 years of my college life. I had reason to remember Jerry Simpson.

Times, like everything else, have changed since those gay nineties. It is a far cry from the slovenly Jerry Simpson with his threadbare campaign coat, his battered slouch hat, and his traditional innocence of hose which in the Kansas language are known as socks, to the fastidious and meticulous agricultural Apollo who now decorates the landscape of the Big Seventh and so ably represents the people of that corner of the earthly paradise known as Kansas. I have reference, as you no doubt know, to our handsome, distinguished, and beloved colleague, Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE.

Jerry Simpson was a contemporary of Thomas Brackett Reed. While they were very good friends, they never ceased to snipe at one another, and each became the target of the other's shafts of wit and satire. It was no one-sided game, for while Simpson may have been shy of hosiery he had plenty of gray matter under that old slouch hat. On one occasion when there occurred a colloquy between the two, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has said, Simpson very dramatically exclaimed:

I would rather be right than President.

To which Mr. Reed replied with his characteristic drawl:

The gentleman from Kansas need not worry, he will never be either.

A new Member, meeting Mr. Reed in the corridor one day and seeing that he was so large, said to him, "How much do you weigh?" Mr. Reed very calmly looked the fellow over and said, "Two hundred pounds." The new Member expressed some doubt and incredulity about it, and Mr. Reed replied, "No gentleman ever weighed more than 200 pounds." [Laughter.]

In repartee Reed's mind worked with the celerity of an electric flash. In exchange of wit he had no peer in the House. In dry sarcasm and withering satire he had no competition in his time.

Mr. Reed made few lengthy speeches partly because he did not like long speeches and partly because he thought anyone ought to say everything worth saying in a short speech. He put whole arguments and treatises in a brief trenchant sentence. Never did anyone better illustrate the trite saying that brevity is the soul of wit. His ideas about long speeches and his aversion to them occurred during the debate on his decision regarding his right to count a Member present whether he answered to a roll call or not. A distinguished Member of the House and a former Speaker had made an exhaustive address on the power, right, and authority of the

Speaker to count a Member present when he refused to answer a roll call. Mr. Reed in one devastating sentence liquidated all the subtle and technical arguments of his opponent when he said:

The gentleman from Georgia has consumed an hour and a half endeavoring to prove to the House that he is not here.

That fight concerning the decision of Speaker Reed to count a quorum precipitated one of the fiercest parliamentary battles that ever raged on this floor. The press, the pulpit, and the bar joined, and during the controversy Speaker Reed received the sobriquet of "Czar Reed." However, the main point is that the Speaker by the sheer force of his character and personal power triumphed in his contention which was upheld by the Supreme Court and afterward unanimously adopted on motion of the Democratic leader who had opposed the Speaker's decision. Imitation is still the sincerest form of flattery.

But bitter was the fight and bitter the feeling engendered, but through it all Speaker Reed maintained that masterful dignity and serene poise that only those possess who know their cause is just and who have the strength and fortitude to wait for the vindication which comes with the invincible argument of time and the iron logic of events. He was accused of trying to wear the crown of a despot and of cheating the House of its rights. He was denounced on the floor of the House as "the worst tyrant that ever presided over a deliberative body." He was proclaimed as "a usurper in defiance of parliamentary law," but through it all with stoic calm he faced the storm and serenely replied:

The House will not allow itself to be deceived by epithets. No man can describe the action and judgment of this Chair in language that will endure unless the description is true. What is done has been done in the face of the world and is subject to its deliberate judgment.

For the first time in the history of the House of Representatives the Speaker was denied the courtesy of the thanks of the House to the retiring Speaker. In the solitude of the Speaker's room Tom Reed realized the bitter irony of human grandeur.

He who ascends the mountain tops shall find
The loftiest peaks most wrapped in clouds and snow,

* * * * *
Round him are the icy rocks and loudly blow
Contending tempests on his naked head,
And thus reward the toils which to those summits led.

But never in the history of the House of Representatives did justification of a ruling and vindication of a Speaker come on such swift wings. In the Fifty-third Congress the House was hopelessly and helplessly floundering around trying to legislate under the old rule, but the House was paralyzed. It was completely bogged down under the lethal curse of a bad rule, until finally the Democratic leader, who had opposed the former Speaker's decision, rose and said:

This is a question of whether this House of Representatives of the people of the United States shall have such rules for its government as will enable it to do the business that our constituents have sent us here to do. We have tried the old system; we have been here a month without doing 2 days' actual business; and our constituents are tired of it, and I hope this House is tired of it. I will hail the adoption of this rule as the dawn of a new era in American legislation.

No vindication could possibly have been more complete, no triumph more thorough. But in that hour of glorious victory this great man rose with quiet dignity and said:

Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to address the House upon the general subject. This scene here today is a more effective address than any I could make. The House is about to adopt the principle for which I contended in the Fifty-first Congress and is about to adopt it under circumstances which show conclusively to the country its value. No words that I can utter can add to the importance of this occasion. I congratulate the Fifty-third Congress upon this wise decision it is about to make.

It was thus that this truly great man accepted his vindication with modest dignity and without bluster or boasting.

It was a generous thought which prompted the House to forget for a few minutes wars and rumors of wars to summon from the past the shadow of this colossal figure and recall

again the events of his brilliant career and to remind a careless public of the life and services of a great national character who at the height of his career was the most commanding and dominant personality of the Republic. To us who yet remember the struggle over the counting of a quorum, it seems but yesterday yet, to use a trite phrase, a great deal of water has run under the bridge since his huge figure strode these halls and corridors. He was Speaker when first the biennial appropriations amounted to \$1,000,000,000. That seemingly insignificant sum in our day raised a great furor, and a billion-dollar Congress became a term of political reproach. Speaker Reed calmly replied that this was a billion-dollar country, being seemingly the first who discovered that fact which has become so obvious in recent years.

It has been just 40 years since Speaker Reed resigned from the House of Representatives, but there is not a Member here who served with him in the House. This reminds us of the transitory character of our service here. I came first to the House in the Sixty-eighth Congress. There are less than 50 Members remaining who were Members at that time. I have been here in 7 successive Congresses and have served under 6 Speakers, all great and good men, 4 of whom have gone to the land of their dreams—gone to join that highly select group of distinguished statesmen who have shared the honor of presiding over this forum of the people fashioned for us by our fathers in the Constitution.

Peace be to their ashes, and sweet be their rest. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the thought which is uppermost in my mind today goes back to my boyhood days. Prior to Speaker Reed's occupancy of that great office, I had never paid any attention to or had any ideas about Congress. He attracted my attention as a young man. He started me to thinking about Congress and its activities and the caliber of its membership. I admired his temerity, his courage, and his real greatness. I felt then, as I have felt ever since, that he has been an inspiration not only to all subsequent Speakers and to the Members of this House but to the youth of our country. His influence has radiated throughout our American public life. His official career has inculcated patriotism, courage, and honesty. His life is an incentive to all public officials to conscientious and loyal service to our country. This House owes him a perpetual debt of gratitude, and our Nation will always gratefully revere his memory.

My home on the Pacific slope of the Rocky Mountains is a long way from Maine. But I can assure you that the people of the West will always have a profound admiration for that great American Thomas B. Reed.

When I came to the House March 4, 1909, Uncle Joe Cannon was Speaker of this House. He and Walter I. Smith, of Iowa, and James A. Tawney, of Minnesota, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, were the Committee on Rules; and those three Republicans appointed both the Republican and the Democratic members on the committees. I joined in the memorable House rebellion and furious fusillade of denunciation in depriving Uncle Joe of all of his powers except merely to preside over the House. He and Speaker Reed had many traits in common. Both were vehemently denounced and vilified. But history will record them as two of the greatest Speakers this House has ever had, and that this House and our country are better off for their courageous public careers. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is pleased to recognize our beloved Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should be entirely recreant to the significance of this memorial service did I not ask the privilege of making a very brief statement in honor of the life and service and character of one of my very great predecessors in the office of Speaker, the Honorable Thomas Brackett Reed, of Maine.

To the student of our system of American politics it is always a very fertile field for the inquiring mind to study

the biographies, as well as the life and times and the political implications and issues involved in the lives and services of the Speakers of this great body. I often go out in the Speaker's lobby, in my quieter and more meditative periods, to look up at the pictured likenesses of these great predecessors of mine who have sat in this chair, who have presided over the deliberations of this body during all the years of our system of constitutional government and who have wrought so largely in the development of representative government here, but also with reference to the destinies of the political issues which were involved in periods when they presided. It should be an inspiration to all of us who love America and her great traditions to go out at times and look into the faces of those men and to remember the times in which they served and the issues with which they were faced. Among all that galaxy of great names whose portraits hang in that place in greatness of intellect and power of party leadership, and, I believe, in innate and pure patriotism, as he conceived his duty and the issues of the times in which he served, none stands higher in the history of this Government and of this body than the great man who was born 100 years ago, Thomas B. Reed.

Mr. Reed has been suggested as somewhat typical of the political development of leaders of his day and generation, and if you will observe the portrait hanging next to him out here in this lobby, you will see a lifelike portraiture of that other great Speaker, Uncle Joe Cannon, of Illinois, with whom many of us here in this body served before his departure, and both of those great Americans and great Republicans were absolutely typical of the highest development in the history of this country and of this body of party government. Looking back upon the methods that they employed when they were in positions of power as compared with our more recent and more tolerant and more liberal policies here in the House of Representatives, it is rather hard to imagine the stern hand with which they absolutely wielded their party power in the House of Representatives and though theoretically now, looking back upon what in retrospection may have been thought of their methods and views, we must necessarily admire the grip they had on their parties and their firm determination to rule this House in large measure according to their view of their public and their party duties.

Reference has been made here by two of the speakers who have preceded me to the very laughable incident that occurred here when Mr. Reed made his retort to the gentleman who would rather be right than President, and it so happened I was a young law student here in Washington at that time and I sat in the gallery up there and saw and heard that very interesting political incident, and that retort on the spur of the moment was absolutely typical of the lightning imagination of that great and fertile brain of Thomas B. Reed.

It is a pleasure to me to say these few words in appreciation of my personal recollection and of my historical appreciation of a great American, a man who, I say, has written his record and his achievements and his intellect and his patriotism so large in the annals of this representative body. I am pleased that the Member from Maine, who is unfortunately absent upon this occasion, has asked the indulgence of this House for these brief tributes to the memory of a great American, and I am sure they will be most cordially received on both sides of this Chamber. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, when I was a child, I lived in Saco, Maine, and Thomas Brackett Reed was my Representative in Congress. He was a great friend of my father, who admired him for his clear thinking, his contagious humor, and his ability as a statesman.

The first letter I ever wrote was to my father, which he cherished always and carried in his pocketbook until the day of his death. It was written while he was on a visit to Washington and was very short and childlike. I remember it clearly. It read: "Dear father, I know you are having a fine time in Washington with Tom Reed." Little did I realize

then that nearly 50 years later I would stand in this House and attempt in a small way to eulogize the great man who was then my idol.

I have heard my father speak so often of the incident of Speaker Reed's counting the quorum which at that time was the topic of the day and the subject of controversy everywhere. It was a turning point; epochal. It was a line of demarcation between archaic, obstructive methods, and an era of orderly business and progress in parliamentary procedure. It took a man of the heroic mold and courage of Reed to draw that line.

Thomas B. Reed was a great man, both physically and mentally. He was a kindly man. He never used his marvelous ability as a debater, his quick wit, to hurt or maliciously belittle his adversary. He was never cruel or bitter in debate.

While stories of him are legion and much of him has been written, there are only three men connected with the Capitol today who served in any capacity during his service. One is Mr. Joseph J. Sinnott, the present efficient Doorkeeper of the House; another, Mr. Andy Smith, whom you all know, the courteous and obliging CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Clerk. The third is William Tyler Page, who is now on the eve of his fifty-seventh year and 10 months of service in this House in many capacities, and incidentally, this is the eve of his birthday anniversary. No one knows more of congressional procedure than he, serving as he has under 13 Speakers of this House. Perhaps Mr. Page learned some of his own great courtesy from Thomas B. Reed. I asked Mr. Page to tell me of his impressions of Mr. Reed, and he told me:

When you beheld Thomas B. Reed you looked upon a great, big man, big in every way, in intellect as big as his colossal physique. He combined all the attributes of a Solon, a Seneca, and a Demosthenes. He towered above his fellows as a Hyperion to a satyr. I first saw Mr. Reed when I came into the House Chamber on the day I entered into the service of the House in 1881, nearly 58 years ago. He was speaking. I was awe-struck and fascinated. I had never before seen such a giant figure, nor heard a man speak with such force, nor as easily. The impression of him I received that day was indelible, and as I grew older my admiration for him increased. Someone said: "History is past politics; politics is present history." If this be true, and I believe it is true, then Thomas B. Reed, in the best sense of the word "politics" as the science of government, made history in a big way.

It is peculiarly appropriate that we should be noting the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of our former Speaker at this time when the world is shaken with war. Mr. Reed was so strongly opposed to war. As he expressed it:

War solves nothing. It is a senseless, brutal waste, and a great danger to our Republic, in that its democratic principles are likely to be destroyed.

He opposed our entry into the Spanish-American War. He was just as firm against our participation in the Philippine Insurrection and our acquisition of the Philippine Islands. As an abolitionist of the old school to whom the selling of men was most abhorrent, he characterized the purchase of the islands as just this. In an ironical letter to the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives he wrote:

Thanks for the statistics which I hope to find use for. * * * I have got to hunt all over your figures even to find out how much each yellow man cost us in the bush. As I make it out he has cost \$30 per Malay and he is still in the bush. Why didn't you purchase him of Spain f. o. b. with definite freight rate and insurance paid?

Mr. Reed knew about war. He was in the Navy during the latter part of the Civil War. He was firmly opposed to this country entering into entangling alliances with foreign nations. Were he here today he would be in the thick of the fight to keep our country neutral and at peace, for he was very anxious to maintain the democracy of the United States.

He was very far-seeing and often far ahead of his times in his beliefs. He felt that women should have suffrage and the right to hold property, and is remembered for his remark that "After all, women are people, are they not?" His viewpoint upon this subject is perhaps best expressed in the following quotation:

The equal rights of women have just reached the region of possibilities. Men have only just left off sneering and have just begun to consider. Every step of progress from the harem and the veil

to free society and property holding has been steadily fought by the vanity, selfishness, and indolence, not only of mankind, but of womankind also.

As a debater and parliamentary leader he won a place in the Nation's history. As a man whose expressions and thoughts were recorded and repeated most widely he exerted a great influence upon the country and upon his time. To my mind, nothing he said so well typifies his greatness and his rule of living as the following:

If we ever learn to treat the living with the tenderness with which we instinctively treat the dead, we shall then have a civilization well worth distributing.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, although I did not begin my service in this House until 21 years ago, 17 years after the death of Thomas Brackett Reed, and was therefore not privileged to have been one of his contemporaries during his eventful career here, covering a period of 22 years, in 6 of which he presided with great distinction as Speaker of the House, yet, like many another of the young men of that era, I learned, through my reading of congressional proceedings and from the lips of prominent Tennesseans who did serve with Mr. Reed, of his outstanding ability and courage, and of his achievements which made history in congressional procedure.

Hence it is, sir, that I feel a just sense of pride that I have the honor here today, on this the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Brackett Reed, to pay tribute to a monumental figure, one of the greatest, if not the greatest, statesmen of the nineteenth century.

I deem it not amiss but appropriate to bring into this picture the names of some of the men from my State of Tennessee who served a part or all of the time Mr. Reed served in this House, from the Forty-fifth to the Fifty-fifth Congresses, inclusive.

From some of these contemporaries of Mr. Reed I learned at first hand of his matchless equipment and public career. Not from members of his own political party alone but from his erstwhile political enemies as well did I receive an appraisal of this remarkable man, because when the record was fully made, when passion and prejudice had subsided and results recorded, those who had regarded him as an arch enemy conceded his ability and greatness and were as vocal in their praise as they had been severe in their condemnation of his political acts.

Among those men from Tennessee, whose names are writ high in its political annals, were the beloved and long-time Senator Isham G. Harris, the able Senator William B. Bate, and the redoubtable and eloquent Edward W. Carmack, who also served with Reed in the House, where he was a doughty opponent.

Then there were Members of the House, names familiar to Tennesseans, my predecessors, Leonidas C. Houk and his son John; William C. Anderson; Henry R. Gibson, who died recently at the age of 100 years; and Jacob M. Thoraburgh, who was colonel of a regiment in which my father served in the Civil War; also Augustus H. Pettibone; Benton McMillin, who served with Reed on the old Rules Committee; J. D. C. Atkins, one-time chairman of Appropriations; Casey Young; W. B. Whitthorne; James D. Richardson, a minority leader and compiler of the messages and papers of the Presidents; Zach and Alf Taylor; Benjamin A. Enloe; Joseph E. Washington; Henry Clay Evans; Rice Pierce; Josiah Patterson; Walter P. Brownlow; John A. Moon; John Wesley Gaines, and Thetus W. Sims.

The 2-year period from 1889 to 1891 covered by the Fifty-first Congress, when Thomas Brackett Reed, of Maine, for the first time was Speaker of the House, was a history-making period. It was the turning point in legislative proceedings. It was epochal and, in a sense, revolutionary. Much legislation awaited action. The Republican Party, with a scant majority of six at the beginning of the session, was confronted with the choice of one of two things—either impotency and the charge of a do-nothing Congress or else

cut the Gordian knot of a system of filibustering which the old rules permitted and enter upon an era of businesslike proceedings. It was up to Speaker Reed to make the decision as to which course would be pursued. He said himself that he hesitated to upset the old order, because, when his party was in the minority, he had found filibustering a handy weapon against a tyrannical majority. Confronted with the responsibility of the speakership and with a small majority, he decided to take the "bull by the horns," the effect of which was a bloodless revolution in the manner of doing business in the House.

Reed was a picturesque character, elephantine in physique and of heroic mental stature as well. Reed was dubbed "the mentor of the Republicans and the tormentor of the Democrats." Politically courageous, an excellent parliamentarian, a natural leader, feared by his enemies, beloved and followed by his friends, although his personality was not such as to invite ready friendship; but men of his own party followed him devotedly in whatever direction he might lead, because they had confidence in his integrity, in his judgment, and in his sagacity. They followed in spite of their own inclinations. Hence there was solidarity; there was the authoritative voice of a leader whom men followed. Knowing this, Reed, when once he had determined upon his course of action, hewed to the line, and his associates backed him up to a man.

In the first place, he operated for 2 months without any rules. He proceeded under what he called general parliamentary law, a term which he coined and which has been used ever since. This term was virtually none other than the parliamentary practice of the House of Representatives itself with respect to certain general principles which Speaker Reed applied to the then existing conditions. In effect, the system meant that the Speaker exercised his judgment and discretion as to what he would allow to come before the House in the absence of written rules. Nevertheless, a parliamentary technician could not legitimately find fault with the Speaker's interpretation of general parliamentary law.

The first necessity was to augment the slender Republican majority, without which the party would be harried throughout the entire Congress and perhaps sometimes outvoted. Conveniently the means to that end were at hand. Some 30 or more election contests were pending. To consider them elections committees were set up and operated under a full head of steam. These cases were decided primarily on political grounds, not judicially. The political exigencies of the occasion precluded judicial investigation and determination which has characterized election cases during the last 30 years. Reports came in rapidly, each recommending the ousting of a Democrat and the seating of a Republican.

The Democrats, as was to be expected, resorted to the time-honored practice of filibustering, a strategy employed by both parties when in the minority. This filibustering, unlike that indulged in by the Senate by marathon speeches, was of a different character. It consisted of pyramiding allowable motions of a dilatory nature, provoking roll call upon roll call to consume time, upon which members of the minority party would refrain from answering, thus breaking a quorum. This style of dilatory tactics would be employed not only in election cases but upon legislation to which the minority objected. And it was this practice of long standing that Reed was determined to stop that required courage of the highest order.

Reed realized that he might be creating a Frankenstein that would return to harass him and his party when they should be in the minority. But the demands of the country for something more than a do-nothing Congress were so great and so much important legislation awaited action that Reed decided the wisest course was to make rules and practices which would transform the House of Representatives from an inert body to one of business methods. So as one by one the Democrats were unseated and supplanted by Republicans, the Republican majority in the 2 months under general parliamentary law increased in the House to workable proportions. In some instances Democrats who held *prima facie* title to seats, and who with their colleagues stepped out of the House momentarily to avoid being counted to make a quorum, found

themselves upon their return divested entirely of their seats and Republicans sworn in to take their places.

It had been a common thing until Reed's time for a minority, political or numerical, to hold up the House in a filibuster by dilatory tactics and by refraining from answering a roll call for the avowed purpose of breaking a quorum. On one occasion the House was held for 2 weeks continuously impotent in the filibustering shirt of Nessus.

That was when the first attempt was made to put through a so-called Force bill which was obnoxious to the South. Such proceedings were farcical. The old rules gave privilege to certain motions, made certain motions preferential to others, and by the use of these allowable motions they could by adroit manipulation become a veritable labyrinth. Upon each one would be a roll call, a time-consuming device. On these roll calls men would sit in their places, refuse to answer, and break a quorum. Then would follow a call of the House, which would develop the fact that a quorum was actually present. The farce would be carried still further by sending for absent Members. Motions were made to fine them, and that would go on ad infinitum day and night without cessation until a responsible majority through sheer physical exhaustion would capitulate to the minority.

But Reed swept all of these methods into the discard. He counted a quorum when a quorum was actually present. Nothing more nor less. It was said that he even counted hats and cloaks in the cloak room which fell within his vision, but that was not true. He did nothing of the kind. He simply directed the clerk to note the names of the Members present who had refrained from voting but who were actually present who, together with those who had answered, made what Reed called a constitutional quorum. The first time he did this it provoked a storm of protest, and a dramatic scene was enacted which probably never had its counterpart.

"At once there rose so wild a yell,
As all the fiends from Heaven that fell,
Had pealed the banner cry of Hell."

The entire Democratic side of the House arose as one man and flung epithets at Reed, some of which are unprintable. Such epithets as czar, tyrant, scoundrel, autocrat, despot, were mild in comparison with others of a very decided personal nature. Some men were so incensed and outraged at being shorn of what they called their rights that they actually attempted to mount the rostrum and do bodily violence to Speaker Reed. These men were met at the steps by the Sergeant-at-Arms and his deputies, and with difficulty, made to desist.

An uproar continued for the space of 10 minutes except that on the Republican side—every man sat still in his seat. While this was going on Speaker Reed, with his giant-like form erect, stood like Ajax defying the lightning. His gaze turned directly upon his assailants with his eyes steadily fixed upon each and every one from left to right. Under that gaze his opponents fell back one by one into their seats exhausted, and when the last man had subsided Reed, in his inimitable down east nasal drawl, said quietly, while resting both hands upon the big end of the gavel, "The House will be in order." Whereupon his Republican colleagues arose as one man and cheered him lustily for 5 minutes. The ax had been laid at the root of the tree, and the most obnoxious feature of filibustering was forever laid low.

Reed then proceeded quietly to read a manuscript decision in which he quoted as authority that eminent Democrat, David B. Hill, of New York, when lieutenant governor, presiding in the New York Senate. Having brushed aside this parliamentary cobweb Reed, with his associates on the Committee on Rules, of which he was chairman, brought in written rules which made impossible a recurrence of the scene just described. These rules also did away with the privilege of certain motions which had been instruments in the hands of the minority; also prohibiting the Speaker from entertaining a dilatory motion. With these rules, following the historic decision of Reed, the majority was equipped for the transaction of business.

That was a busy Congress. A tariff bill was passed, the McKinley bill. Speaker Reed's quorum-counting device was

upheld by the Supreme Court in *U. S. v. Ballin* (144 U. S., p. 1). The case was brought on the ground that Reed had counted a quorum on the passage of a bill providing for the classification of worsteds. The Court said that it could not go beyond the Journal. The Journal showed the presence of a constitutional quorum. That set the question at rest forever and the new rules, now in vogue, furnish a method agreeable to all whereby a quorum can be procured and a vote taken simultaneously, known as the automatic roll call.

The Reed Congress had been all but annihilated in the election in 1890. That had been a billion dollar Congress, the first in history. Reed's reply to the charge of extravagance was that it was a billion-dollar country. In his valedictory Reed said we were too close to those events justly to appraise them, but that history would vindicate his course of action. So bitter was the partisan feeling against Reed that the Democrats refused to vote for a resolution of thanks offered by Reed's Republican colleagues, one of the comparatively few times a Speaker was denied a vote of thanks unanimously.

In the succeeding Congress, the Fifty-second, the Republicans had but a vestige or remnant of their power. Eighty-nine Members of that party, only, were elected. At first the Democrats who had so severely criticised the Reed rules and the Reed procedure refused to adopt the Reed rules, but gradually they did adopt them because they found it necessary, if they were to do business, to resort to the same methods which they had so severely condemned.

Among Mr. Reed's many attributes was a high sense of humor. He loved a good joke and delighted in telling one. He was seldom outwitted in debate. But upon one occasion he was floored completely by a shaft of humor, which he appreciated, although at his own expense.

"Tom" Reed and "Sunset" Cox were good friends. But they often clashed parliamentary swords. One day Reed was larruping Cox unmercifully. His sarcasm and wit were plied in his best down-east drawl. The entire Democratic membership crowded over to the Republican side to better hear Reed's every word, leaving all Democratic seats vacant. Cox was not present. Noticing his absence, a friend hurried to the Ways and Means Committee room, where Cox was engaged, and told him of Reed's attack upon him. Presently Cox entered the door leading to the Democratic side and strolled, unobserved, to his seat, an oasis in the desert of empty chairs. Reed had the House spellbound. Cox, utterly alone, heard Reed's bitter invective until Reed stopped for breath. Then, quick as a flash, Cox was on his feet, his diminutive body hardly reaching above his desk, calling for recognition.

As soon as he uttered in strident tone the words "Mr. Speaker" every eye in the space was turned from Reed to him. Not waiting to be recognized by the Speaker, Cox, pointing his finger mockingly at the giant figure of Reed, cried, "Mr. Speaker, a Reed shaken with the wind." Not another word. The applause and laughter following, in which Reed joined, was tumultuous.

When "Tom" Reed was Speaker of the House, the Chaplain was the blind and eloquent orator Milburn. Milburn got into the habit of praying against gambling in stocks and bonds. Dunham, a stocky, swarthy Member of the House from Chicago, was a prominent member of the Chicago Stock Exchange. So regular and persistent were the Chaplain's daily attacks upon "bucket shops" that Dunham, whose name had figured prominently in certain doings in the Chicago "pit," went to "Tom" Reed and objected vehemently to what he said was getting to be "personal." Speaker Reed only smiled and, in his inimitable drawl, said, "Aw, Dunham, do not mind that; it is only the Chaplain's way of telling the Lord all the news."

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Brackett Reed died in Washington, December 7, 1902. On the next day Mr. James S. Sherman, of New York, afterward Vice President of the United States, offered, and the House adopted, the following resolution:

Resolved, That the following minute be spread upon the Record of the House of Representatives:

"Hon. Thomas Brackett Reed died in Washington December 7, 1902. For 22 years he had been a Member of this House; for 6

years its Speaker. His service terminated with the Fifty-fifth Congress. Within this Chamber the scene of his life's great activities was laid. Here he rendered services to his country which placed him in the front rank of American statesmanship. Here he exhibited characteristics which compelled respect and won admiration. Forceful ability, intrinsic worth, strength of character brought him popular fame and congressional leadership. In him depth and breadth of intellect, with a full and well-rounded development, had produced a giant who towered above his fellows and impressed them with his power and his wisdom. A distinguished statesman, a lofty patriot, a cultured scholar, an incisive writer, a unique orator, an unmatched debater, a master of logic, wit, satire, and most famous of the world's parliamentarians, the great and representative citizen of the American Republic has gone into history."

Mr. Speaker, to this fine and deserved tribute nothing can be added and nothing taken away.

Thomas Brackett Reed, a colossal figure, whose deeds will live eternally in American history.

Mr. Speaker, when I resolved a few days ago to take advantage of this occasion to pay my humble tribute to a great American, I conferred with my good friend, Hon. Tyler Page, who is recognized and esteemed by both sides of this Chamber as an infallible monitor on matters that have transpired in this House during the past half century. Mr. Page knew Tom Reed and had the good fortune to observe him in action. I am indebted to Mr. Page for many of the facts I have outlined in this address, and I desire to make acknowledgment accordingly. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the spring of 1897 is something more to me than just another year, for its is indelibly marked in my memory, and the picture of the city of Washington which hangs on my mental walls as of that date is fixed and unchanging.

I would not be human did I not egotistically admit that I have a photograph taken of me as I came down here on that last of February in order to be present to assist in arranging for the inaugural parade as one of the deputy grand marshals under Gen. Granville M. Dodge at the inauguration of President McKinley. To those who realize, as Hazlett did, that "there is a feeling of eternity in youth which makes us amends for everything; to be young is to be as one of the immortals," no apology need be made for my having had my photograph taken or for the foregoing personal allusion.

Upon arrival in Washington I found time to visit the House of Representatives. I saw and I heard in action the intellectual and physical giant, Thomas Brackett Reed, the "czar," whose anniversary we are observing.

My boyish admiration for him and for his accomplishments has lost none of its ardor with the passing of the years. I still like to read his speeches and to refer to his parliamentary rulings and decisions which he made, and which made history.

There is not a fairly intelligent college student in New England today—I might well say the country—who does not know, or whose father before him did not know, at least one or two anecdotes which wrap themselves around the personality and individuality of this man Reed. No one will ever forget the story of the telegram received by him from an absent Member of Congress, summoned to help make up a quorum, who wired, "Wash-out on line; can't come," to which the inimitable Thomas B., as Speaker, replied, "Buy another shirt and come on the next train."

Another unforgettable one—a matter of record—was when Representative Springer, of Illinois, concluded his peroration with that oft-quoted saying attributed to Henry Clay to the effect that he would rather be right than be President, whereupon Representative Reed rose to remark, "Well, the gentleman never will be either."

Underneath the glove of geniality, affability, and good fellowship there rested, however, the hand of steel. I intend to speak only briefly with respect to his career as a Congressman.

You recall, as has been suggested, that he claimed that the code of rules of the House was a systematic outrage on government by a majority, and that "the only way to do business inside the rules was to suspend the rules. The object of the

rules," he said, "appeared to be to prevent the transaction of business."

As one of the leaders of the House after the election in 1888, he was the natural selection for Speaker, except for the fact that he came from one of the smallest States, remote from the center of population, and so the argument founded on geography, "logically not appealing but often convincing in our politics," was against him. Some of you students of political history will recall that among his opponents for the speakership were McKinley, of Ohio, and Henderson, of Iowa. Strong men. Representative Lodge, of Massachusetts, was for him and all of New England was solidly behind him. In the end his skillful and born leadership of his party in the House became the controlling reason, together with the recognition of the fact that since he had borne the brunt of the fighting to him should come the recognition of victory, and he was elected on December 2, 1889, receiving 166 votes as against 154 for Representative Carlisle.

Now 166 votes measured not only the Republican strength but it also was the necessary number to constitute a quorum. Subsequently a Republican Member died, leaving the Republicans with less than a quorum. This made history from a parliamentary standpoint. In order to do business a quorum was necessary. That the Republicans could not command a quorum under the existing rules was obvious. Something had to be done, and Reed did it. He made up his mind upon the policy which he should pursue. He did not propose to surrender; and if his party failed to sustain him, he had determined, and he had so advised Elihu B. Root that he was determined, to resign the Speakership and to retire from the House. And so there came a day when only 163 Members of the House answered to their names on a quorum roll call. Instead of ordering another roll call, Speaker Reed calmly said, "The Chair directs the Clerk to record the names of the following Members present and refusing to vote," and he proceeded to name a number of Democrats, among whom were Carlisle and several of the other Democratic leaders then present and who were present when their names were called, and who had refrained from voting. Of course, there was an uproar. No such pandemonium or explosion was ever before witnessed in any legislative body. Passionate remonstrances followed the calling of the names by the Clerk, as directed by the Speaker, and he was denounced bitterly and caustically, as was his course as a revolutionist and revolutionary.

The tumult absolutely stopped the business of the House, but the Speaker remained as calm as a cucumber, and at intervals of calm and quiet he would add to his count the name of some other Member present who had refrained from voting. In the midst of this tumult, one Member, whose name the Clerk had been directed to call, rose and said, "I deny your right, Mr. Speaker, to count me as present, and I desire to read from parliamentary law on that subject." Whereupon the Speaker raised a hearty laugh by coolly saying in reply, and with his customary drawl, "The Chair is making a statement of fact that the gentleman from Kentucky is present. Does he deny it?"

At last the tumult subsided and Speaker Reed gave the House the right to overrule him by an appeal to be taken from his decision. He stated his reasons briefly but so clearly that no number of words added to it could more clearly define it. He held, referring to the constitutional power of the House to compel the attendance of absent Members, that—

If Members can be present and refuse to exercise their function—to wit, not be counted as a quorum—that provision would seem to be entirely nugatory. Inasmuch as the Constitution only provides for their attendance, that attendance is enough. If more was needed, the Constitution would have provided for more.

His biographer, the Honorable Samuel W. McCall, has the following to say with respect to what happened when this ruling was made:

This ruling was followed by a scene of disorder even greater than that which had preceded it, and for 3 days the House was a perfect bedlam. The Speaker was denounced not only in parliamentary but in unparliamentary terms. All the old weapons in the arsenal

of obstruction were brought into play, and one after another Reed ruled them out of order. Some of them he declared were not even subject to an appeal from the Chair. One Member—Breckinridge of Kentucky—shouted: "The Speaker's decision is clearly corrupt." Reed was accused of being a czar and of usurping jurisdiction. His decision was pronounced revolutionary, which was doubtless correct when it is compared with the decisions made by Speakers for a great number of years. There was little difficulty in showing in the argument which followed that the Speaker had overruled all the precedents, and that he, himself, in common with all the Members of the House who had borne any important part in its proceedings, had recognized the opposite procedure. He did not pretend that he was obeying the precedents of the House, but admitted that he was overruling them. He simply reverted to the terms of the Constitution and claimed that the quorum established by that instrument was a present and not a voting quorum. During those 3 days of wild excitement apparently the coolest man in the House was the Speaker.

The debate was noteworthy in point of ability, Carlisle, Crisp, and Turner distinguishing themselves on the Democratic side while McKinley, Cannon, and Butterworth led on the Republican side. Perhaps the ablest speech of the debate was made by Butterworth. He argued that a representative was chosen to serve not merely his own constituency but the whole country, and that he had no warrant to attempt to paralyze the action of the House, but that the country had a right to require that he should be in his place and perform his duties. "For that reason the Constitution provides that those who are here may, by force, bring the rest of the Members into this Hall, not merely to serve their own constituents, but to serve that broader constituency, the people of this country whose servants they are." What was the object of the power to compel Members to attend?

To leave the House in precisely the same condition as before they were brought in, a condition which rendered it necessary to bring them in to change and improve it? Was this authority conferred by the Constitution only to enable us to go through the farce of bringing in the absentees and learning after each Member has been seated in his place that, while under the Constitution he is actually personally present to make a quorum to do business, yet when an attempt is made to do the thing which required his presence, he at once by merely closing his mouth becomes constructively absent? Or he may, in fact, while present, arise in his place and assert that he is absent, and we must take his word for it. What an absurdity on the face of it, no matter how sanctified by age. It is the weapon of the revolutionist. It is the weapon of anarchy.

At last the question whether the Speaker's decision should be overruled was submitted to the House. A mere handful of the Republicans voting with the Democrats would have overthrown the Speaker and his ruling. But his party stood with him to a man. After much filibustering the ruling was sustained.

Thus was established the most important landmark in the parliamentary practice of the House. It seems difficult to believe that there should ever have been any other construction put upon the Constitution than that the power to compel the attendance of absent Members in order to secure a quorum was for the purpose of enabling the House to transact the business of the country, and not simply for the purpose of permitting those who were present to look upon the faces of those who had been absent. Not merely did the Supreme Court subsequently sustain the constitutionality of Reed's ruling, but within a brief period, by the endorsement of his party antagonists, it was destined to become the settled law of the House. In the two next succeeding Congresses the House was controlled by the Democrats and the ancient practice was re-established. At an important juncture they found themselves unable to procure a quorum from their own ranks. And as Reed had established the new precedent, so there came to him the distinction of forcing his antagonists to ratify it. After his retirement from the Speakership he had become the leader of the Republicans upon the floor. He inaugurated a determined filibuster and under his lead the Members of his party declined to vote. For weeks the House was unable to make the slightest progress in the transaction of business. It was bound hand and foot. The deadlock was at last broken by the adoption of a rule providing that a Member who was present might be counted for the purpose of making a quorum, whether he voted or not. The fact that the counting under the Democratic rule was to be done by two tellers made no difference in the principle involved, and ever since that time the rule of a present instead of a voting quorum, as established by Reed, has been the rule of the House, no matter by what party it has been controlled.

The ruling has resulted in saving a great amount of the time of the House and has facilitated the transaction of its business. It has done away with a system which might in critical times produce a paralysis of our popular representative assembly, and it has conduced to party responsibility. This achievement stands as a signal triumph for Reed's clearness of vision; and in the strength with which he maintained his position against tremendous pressure and in the face of the precedents of a century, and in the serene courage and self-control with which he bore himself amid those violent and stormy scenes without parallel in the history of Congress, it furnishes convincing proof of the greatness of his character.

Mr. John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi, once said of him that he was "that ever memorable genius, the ablest running debater the American people ever saw."

Henry Cabot Lodge said:

I fully appreciate the truth of Emerson's doctrine of the force of understatement; but I cannot express my own belief in regard to Mr. Reed without also saying that, in my opinion, there never has been a greater or more perfectly equipped leader in any parliamentary body at any period.

"The mentor of the Republicans and the tormentor of the Democrats," as has been suggested, he was characterized once on this floor by Lafe Pence, from Colorado; his fame as a Representative in Congress rests on his quorum-counting rule, and upon his wit, humor, and sarcasm. Champ Clark well said that Reed was the best short speechmaker he ever saw or heard. He rarely spoke at length; generally stopped in 5, 10, or 15 minutes. His speeches were strong in proportion to their shortness, of dynamic quality; and, as Speaker Clark said—

It is not in the constitution of man to digest too much mental dynamite at one time.

Lowell says, you remember, that "in general those who, having nothing to say, contrive to spend the longest time in doing it."

Senator John Tyler Morgan, of Alabama, gave him the nickname, "the Great White Czar," which characterization was apt and stuck; for, standing 6 feet 3 inches, with a No. 12 shoe, and weighing close to 300, with a massive two-story head, flaxen hair, large brilliant black eyes, he was a marked man in a crowd.

A statesman, he said in answer to a correspondent, is a successful politician who is dead. Whereupon he was asked, "Why don't you die and become a statesman?" To which Reed replied, "No; fame is the last infirmity of noble minds."

Jonathan Prentice Dolliver once told him that if he had spent his many years in Congress formulating great measures for his country's good, instead of making sarcastic epigrams about people he disliked, he might have been President. Shortly thereafter, in alluding to two of his colleagues in the House, Reed said:

They never open their mouths without subtracting from the sum of human knowledge.

In his invaluable work, *My Quarter Century of American Politics*, Champ Clark says of him:

He was opposed to the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands; he was opposed to our War with Spain; and he was so thoroughly opposed to our policy touching the Philippines that his conscience would not permit him to remain in public life, which he so much adored. So he resigned to practice law in New York, and in the few years remaining to him amassed an ample competency, but which he did not live long to enjoy.

Mr. Reed came back to Washington on or about Tuesday, December 1, 1902, in order to attend the Gridiron dinner which was to be held on the following Saturday. Let Samuel L. Powers tell the story:

The Gridiron dinner took place in the large ballroom of the Arlington Hotel on the Saturday evening following. It was known that Mr. Reed was at the hotel and that he was ill, but it was not understood that he was seriously ill. There was a large gathering of some 400 persons, including the President, the Vice President, members of the Cabinet, Justices of the Supreme Court, Ambassadors, Senators, Representatives, and Governors of several States. Just as the clock struck midnight the clerk of the hotel opened the door, touched me on the shoulder, and said, "Mr. Reed has passed away; I think you better speak to the presiding officer." At that time Justice Brewer was making a speech. It was a thoroughly convivial occasion, as all such dinners were.

When I notified the president that Mr. Reed was no more, he arose and requested Justice Brewer to be seated. He then announced the death of the great commoner and stated that Mr. Reed had come to Washington for the sole purpose of attending this banquet. He said there was one song that Mr. Reed was always very fond of, that the audience would sing that song, and that would close the dinner.

After the singing of the song this large assemblage moved out of the hall; there was hardly a word spoken; there was many a wet cheek, and there was a feeling in the breast of everyone that the life of one of our greatest Americans had closed.

I have seen the marble statue of him, erected to his memory by the appreciative constituency of Maine, sitting on the crest of the hill in that most beautiful section of Portland. The figure is, as has been said, giantlike and majestic, seem-

ing hardly larger than life to those who knew him, standing silhouetted against the sky as if to typify the high background against which shine the deeds of his public life. This monument was unveiled at Portland on August 31, 1910, and upon that occasion, in his address at the unveiling, the Honorable Samuel W. McCall paid this tribute to his memory:

Beyond his brilliancy as a debater, his resplendent wit, and his skill as a parliamentary leader, his title to remembrance rests upon his quality as a statesman. He had a great ambition, but it was not great enough to lead him to surrender any principle of government which he deemed vital. Like Webster, like Clay, and others of our most conspicuous statesmen, he was disappointed at not reaching the Presidency, but he could fitly aspire to that office, for he was of the fiber and nurture out of which great Presidents are made. He probably would not have been a continuously popular President, but our great Presidents never have been. He had that supreme quality which was seen in Washington breasting the popular anti-British feeling and asserting against France our diplomatic independence; in Lincoln bearing the burden of unsuccessful battles and holding back the sentiment for emancipation until the time was ripe for freedom; in Grant facing the popular clamor and vetoing inflation; and in Cleveland alienating his party while he persisted in as righteous and heroic a battle as was ever waged by a President.

A great nation cannot make up its mind in a moment. What first appears to its fancy is not likely to appeal to its final judgment, and the severest test of the disinterestedness of the statesman under our system is his readiness to risk unpopularity and defeat in order to protect the people from their first impulse and give them an opportunity to form a real opinion. Reed's faith was in what he called the deliberate judgment of the people, but he declared that "the sudden and unreflecting judgment of the noisy who are first heard is quite as often a voice from the underworld."

This distinction is vital, since the cause of democracy has nothing to hope from the statesman who weakly yields to the temptation always to be popular and who panders to the noisy passions of the moment rather than consults the real interests of the people. Reed recognized no divinity in an unthinking clamor, whether raised by one man or a great mass of men. The people could no more depend on inspiration to guide them in performing their public duties than in their private affairs. In each case reflection and work were equally necessary. He showed his reverence for representative government by the calm dignity with which he bore himself during more than two decades of service. He was sometimes compelled to struggle to maintain himself but he scorned to make the struggle upon demagog lines or to swerve from the straight path upon which he moved with so much majesty. He was not priggish up with the commonplace sort of greatness, with a padded and theatric make-up staged to strike the imaginations of little men or to set wagging the puffing pens of little writers. He was no self-advertiser and ran no press bureaus to trumpet his real or imaginary virtues. He sought no mere noisy and ephemeral fame, but he lived upon a plane visible at history's perspective, and he grandly wove his life into the texture of his time.

And so you rear this statue. And you do well to rear it, for although his memory is one of the treasures of the whole country, it was you who gave him to the Nation. He was the product of the sky and soil of Maine, lightened by her sunshine and hardened by her storms. As a representative acts well or ill he reflects credit or discredit upon those who have chosen him. By this test how signally he honored you. But you equally honored yourselves when, amid all the shifting popular vagaries and the following of false gods, you permitted yourselves to be guided by the better genius of popular government and kept this heroic figure for so long a time in the service of his country. And when he returned his commission to you he could truthfully say, as he proudly said, "No sail has been trimmed for any breeze or any doubtful flag ever flown." That noble phrase gives the keynote to his character as a statesman. The only colors he was willing to fight under were those that represented his own principles. He never sailed just for the sake of sailing, but to make progress upon a straight course. He did not take his inspiration and direction from the winds, but from the stars.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

MARBLE BUST OF THOMAS BRACKETT REED

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER], I am pleased to introduce at this time a resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 315

Resolved, That the sum of \$2,500 is authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House for the procurement of a marble bust of Thomas Brackett Reed, for 22 years a distinguished Member of this House from the State of Maine, and for 6 years its Speaker, the expenditure to be made under the direction of the Committee on the Library.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I was graciously extended the privilege of addressing the House for 20 minutes this afternoon. I ask unanimous consent that that time be transferred to tomorrow afternoon, after the disposition of business on the calendar and the other special orders already made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my application for time to speak today and have the same time for Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein excerpts from four important laws and decrees that have been passed and issued by the nations of the world with respect to embargoing arms. The cost exceeds the amount allowed for printing ordinarily and I have an estimate from the printer and ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to extend the remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein a short editorial from a trade magazine known as Better Castings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by placing in the RECORD a statement I made before the Committee on Reciprocity Information.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and the special orders heretofore made, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL] may have 20 minutes in which to address the House on Tuesday next, after the special orders already set for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House heretofore made, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, if the people could only understand the changes which are constantly taking place in the Nation, as a result of propaganda and the activities of a group which does not have our interest at heart, I would not fear the final outcome, for our people would be safe and our Nation secure. It is in the knowledge of these subversive activities that I have suggested, since the first week in

Congress, that we resume the responsibility of the Government.

Let me quote from my first address to the House on January 20, 1939:

I do not look upon such public interest and reaction lightly for there are definite causes for such mass protests. It is said where there is smoke there is fire, and I believe it is well for Congress to remember that our Nation is smoldering. Someday it may break into a destructive fire of public upheaval.

Someone is responsible, and it is not the people. It is not industry, commerce, business, labor, agriculture, professional, or any other earning group. It is not President Roosevelt, ex-President Hoover, or any other President, for no legislative power is delegated to the Chief Executive. Responsibility cannot be placed on departments, or upon subdivisions thereof, and it cannot be blamed on a particular administration.

The blame for all must be placed on the majority in Congress which has supported unconstitutional legislation; upon those who have treated lightly their oath of obligation to preserve, to protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. The people themselves are also to blame for not having elected to office men who embrace the Constitution as the greatest instrument ever drafted for the protection of the people.

I am not interested in the enactment of laws. We have too many. I am, however, interested in the people who have labored and helped to create and build the wonderful structure we live in. For 2 years I shall use every effort to warn the people to protect themselves and their rights by sending men to Congress who will adhere to and support the Constitution instead of destroying it by enactment of unsound and unconstitutional laws.

We, the Members of Congress, should bear in mind that Congress represents all the people in all the States; that when laws are enacted to help one group, they hurt another. If laws are enacted to punish one group of the people, it is a pain in the neck to all the people. We must stand together or hang singly. When the people's rights are restricted or removed by laws, one by one, when the last is removed, Congress has, by such legislation and confiscation of rights, transformed our Government into a legal despotism. I want every man, woman, and child to understand that and never forget it.

It is now in order for someone to introduce a resolution that Congress resume its rightful position to the people, as provided for in the Constitution. That would be the manly and the proper thing to do, instead of passing the buck and blaming someone else for our own mistakes.

Congress cannot evade responsibility by general accusations, because the people are too intelligent, and they are doing their own thinking. If I am right, and I believe I am, let us begin now to get business going in a businesslike manner so that our idle people may be gainfully employed. We cannot increase consuming power by Federal spending. It just does not work—never has and never will. All business must either be run by the people or by the Government. There is no middle road. To expect business to operate and to furnish money to the Government so it in return may use such money to foster or enter into competition with its own benefactor—business—can only end in idleness, poverty, suffering, and revolution. Yes; and horoscope entrepreneurs. The people are ill from technicalities, graphitis, and statistics. The people are sick of laws, restrictions, and regulations; and, Mr. Speaker, I am in accord and in sympathy with them.

The people should now take the law into their own hands by insisting that all departments in the Federal Government adhere to the Constitution; that all laws enacted in conflict with the Constitution be repealed, one by one, so that the people's rights may be restored. That will start the wheels of industry going, furnish employment, increase consumption, build prosperity, and return the American smile to our people.

Mr. Speaker, that was my credo on January 3, 1939, when I took an obligation, with other Members of this House, "to preserve, to protect, and to defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies," and I have not changed today.

During the first session I spoke and wrote on many subjects, often bluntly but never with anything except the interests of my people and my country at heart.

Today I speak with no hatreds toward anyone or any nation. I speak instead as a servant of the people and with respect to this Republic to which I have dedicated all my efforts.

During the period I have been a Member of the House I have not seen one newspaper which has taken up a battle for constitutional government; for the rights of the people and business to operate free from Federal meddling and interference; for liquidation of the many Federal corporations which have been created by special acts of Congress and also under State corporation laws; for repeal of the Gold Reserve Act, which robbed our own people of sound money. Yes, an act that reduced the sales price of American commodities to foreign nations 40 percent, or from \$1

to 60 cents; an act that allows a foreign government stable money and our own people "hocus-pocus" money.

No, the newspapers said nothing about this act that sold our Nation to the money changers and placed our people in slavery, to entrench greed. The newspapers do not give publicity to a Federal employment list large enough to administrate the whole world. Does any newspaper come out against immigration of fanatical Communists that are now undermining and destroying our Nation? No, indeed; no mention is made of this. But let three or four Members in Congress come out in support of sound government and against the steady incoming stream of Communists, and they are at once called Nazi, Fascist, and anti-Semitic. If the same Members oppose the administration's "must" legislation, such as the present Neutrality Act, they are accused of being anti-English, antiracial, anti-Roosevelt, and anti-administration. I often wonder if the objectors have sworn fealty to the President instead of the Constitution of the United States. One seems to risk his life and reputation when he attempts to expose those engaged in subversive destruction of our Government. In face of these acrimonious attacks one is nearly afraid to mention the Constitution of the United States, let alone naming those who have used it for a doormat for the British Government.

Since publishing in the daily Record, October 11, 1939, a letter that anyone can buy for two cents and a half, I have been subjected to abuse and slander, when I should, instead, receive gratitude from the Nation, if it is true, and from the friends of Col. E. M. House if it is untrue. Publication of this report is an act of justice to those concerned, for it will set this matter right.

While I have received one letter that questions the authenticity of the report and another that calls me "dumb," I have also received others, and here are excerpts from one of them:

DEAR SIR: Do not back-pedal on this issue. There is every reason to credit it. . . . Officers from Great Britain, sent over here in the World War period to recruit our men, money, and munitions. Taking just New York City, at that time the British, with their tanks, behaved in New York as if they already owned it. . . . Being on active recruiting duty, this came directly under my eyes.

Now, Mr. THORKELSON, you can investigate a thing of real concern to our country as regards the use intended for the large sum set aside, and being expended by Nicholas Murray Butler for alleged world peace. If you cannot do it, then it is up to the Dies committee to let the public have the facts as regards that money.

When a student at Columbia I protested against the British crown over our flag on the flagstaff and suggested that it should be removed. My professor agreed with me. He remarked, "That is not as brazen as the Carnegie Foundation Fund; the document sets forth it is with the hope that one day America will be back under the British flag. . . ."

For God and our country help America to get back to America and shake off all of these designing leeches.

I have quoted a few brief excerpts from this letter, deleting the names and personal references, simply to show what is in the minds of the people, and what information they might have.

I shall now quote from the biographies of Cecil Rhodes and Andrew Carnegie. Please understand again that my quotation is for one purpose, and that is to show the internationalists' trend to ultimately bring the United States into one union under British dominion. It might seem presumptuous to bring out these facts, yet I believe the American people ought to know them before it is too late.

The beginning of the undermining of America was brought by Cecil Rhodes, who in 1877 left money to establish scholarships at Oxford for the purpose of training diplomats to foster the reunion of Britain and America. In the first draft of his will, which is quoted in the book, Cecil Rhodes, by Basil Williams, or the book, Cecil Rhodes, by Sarah Gertrude Millen, he stated:

"Directed that a secret society should be endowed with the following objects: 'The extension of British rule throughout the world; the colonization by British subjects of all lands where the means of livelihood are attainable by energy, labor, and enterprise; and especially the occupation by British settlers of the entire continent of Africa, the Holy Land, the Valley of the Euphrates, the islands of Cyprus and Candia, the whole of South America, the islands of the Pacific not heretofore possessed by Great Britain, the whole of the Malay Archipelago, the seaboard of China and Japan, the ultimate

recovery of the United States of America as an integral part of the British Empire,' 'The foundation of so great a power as to hereafter render wars impossible and promote the best interests of humanity.'"

A new will was made:

"He substituted English-speaking peoples for actual Britons; he came to realize his limitations and reduce his scheme to a mere beginning of it, the scholarships; but yet the thought behind each successive will remained the same—the world for England, England for the world." (See p. 145, Cecil Rhodes, by Sarah Gertrude Millen.)

Other quotations:

Page 377: "But the essence of the will, as the world knows, is the scholarship foundation. In the end all that Rhodes can do toward extending British rule throughout the world and restoring Anglo-Saxon unity and founding a guardian power for the whole of humanity is to arrange for a number of young men from the United States, the British colonies, and Germany to go to Oxford. There are, accordingly, rather more Rhodes scholars from America than from all the British dominions put together."

Page 378: "If the Union of South Africa could be made under the shadow of Table Mountain, why not an Anglo-Saxon union under the spires of Oxford?"

Mr. HOFFMAN. Where did you say that was?

Mr. THORKELSON. That is in New York. By the way, that is where the Communist Party was organized when Felix Frankfurter was up there, a member of the Civil Liberties Union. That is recorded in a House document as well.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Organized in New York?

Mr. THORKELSON. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thought the Communist Party originated in Russia.

Mr. THORKELSON. No; I do not think so.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is that the place where the alien Communist leader, Sam Ginsberg, alias General Krivitsky, went when he illegally entered the United States several years ago?

Mr. THORKELSON. I do not know.

In 1893 Andrew Carnegie wrote his book, Triumphant Democracy, the last chapter of which is the Reunion of Britain and America. (The 1931 edition of this book is devoid of this last chapter.) The following is a quotation from the original book:

"Regarding those I should like Britons to consider what the proposed reunion means. Not the most sanguine advocate of imperial federation dares to intimate that the federation that he dreams of would free the markets of all its members to each other. This question cannot even be discussed when imperial conferences meet; if it be introduced it is judiciously shelved. But an Anglo-American reunion brings free entry here of all British productions as a matter of course."

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKELSON. I yield.

Mr. HOUSTON. I just wanted to digress for a moment, if the gentleman will permit me. I would like to know how this Ginsberg got into this country in the first place. I understand that for 17 years he acknowledged he was a leader in the Russian secret police. Is he legally here or illegally here? If illegally here, why is he not put out?

Mr. THORKELSON. I might tell the gentleman that I have a list of several hundred that are criminals who came into the United States and have been convicted of crimes in foreign countries. Under the present authority that is now in control, I can give you the initials of them and the crimes for which they have been convicted.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. That gentleman was issued a passport by the former Premier of France, Mr. Blum, and he should be deported immediately because the law prohibits their entrance and requires their deportation.

Mr. THORKELSON. I thank you very much, but let me please proceed.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. When you get through, will you yield for a question?

Mr. THORKELSON. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON. I think that anybody who is here illegally should be deported and we ought to take steps to see that they are deported, Ginsberg or Lipshitz or anyone else.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. DICKSTEIN is chairman of the Immigration Committee and I am sure he knows of a lot of them.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is exactly what I would like to ask you a question about.

Mr. THORKELSON. Just a moment. By the way, I can call your attention to a gentleman by the name of Friedlander. Do you know him?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No.

Mr. THORKELSON. You do not know him? You do not know he perjured himself in Bermuda?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I wish the gentleman would give me that information.

Mr. THORKELSON. I will give it to you.

To continue:

"The richest market in the world is opened to Britain free of all duty by a stroke of the pen. No tax revenue, although under free trade such taxes might still exist. What would not trade with the Republic, duty-free, mean to the linen, woolen, iron, and steel industries of Scotland, to the tinplate manufacturers of England? It would mean prosperity to every industry in the United Kingdom, and thus, in turn, would mean renewed prosperity to the agricultural interests now so sorely depressed.

"In the event of reunion, the American manufacturers would supply the interior of the country, but the great population skirting the Atlantic seaboard and the Pacific coast would receive their manufactured articles chiefly from Great Britain."

And still another quotation:

"Time may dispel many pleasing illusions and destroy many noble dreams, but it shall never shake my belief that the wound caused by the wholly unlooked-for and undesired separation of the mother from her child is not to bleed forever. Let men say what they will; therefore, I say, that as surely as the sun in the heavens once shone upon Britain and America united, so surely is it one morning to rise, shine upon, and greet again the reunited state—the British-American union."

1914: Andrew Carnegie took over the controlling group of the Federal Council of Churches by subsidizing what is known as the Church Peace Union with \$2,000,000, and the Church Peace Union, or the board of trustees, has always exercised a dominating influence in the Federal Council. This endowment has provided sufficient annual income to run the budget of the Federal Council and its cooperating organizations. Among the associated groups are the World's Alliance of International Friendship Through the Churches, Commission on International Friendship and Good Will, National Council for Prevention of War, and American Civil Liberties Union. (See Pastors, Pacifists, and Politicians, pp. 5-6, published by the Constructive Educational Publishing Co., 5421 Ridgewood Court, Chicago.)

I have purposely quoted Cecil Rhodes and Carnegie to show that there has been a deliberate attempt for years to put the United States into the British union.

I can readily understand why a Britisher wants the United States in the Empire, but I do not understand why an American would want to be there. These Anglophiles are found in our colleges and other institutions of learning. These are found in the various leagues of peace, for democracy, for conciliation, nonsectarian antileagues, and other organizations along similar lines. As fronts for these leagues we find these Anglophiles, and I believe I am safe when I say that a goodly proportion of them do not understand the principles of our own Government. All of these organizations seem so plausible that most of us fall in with them without actually realizing the danger.

Who would ever believe that the League of Nations, for world peace, was in reality intended to be a world policing body? Who would ever believe that the League of Nations was to be the internationalist's government or the invisible government of the world? Anyone who advanced such an idea would be ridiculed. But in spite of this, that was the real purpose of the League of Nations. These high-sounding and idealistic organizations are always to be suspected, for there is usually "a nigger in the wood pile." There is always something within them working for an interest opposed to our own.

It is for that reason that I have advocated that we adhere strictly to the Constitution of the United States, and that we take our bearings from this instrument instead of fooling around with queer people and queer ideas.

In my remarks in the Record I have attempted to acquaint the people with conditions throughout the world, for I believe it is very important, particularly at this time, that we should know facts and that such facts should be stated without fear or favor. I shall refer briefly to the report that was inserted in the daily Record October 11, 1939. Mr. Speaker, I ask first the unanimous consent of the House to have the

name "British Consulate, New York City," and the names of the writer and the addressee deleted from the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAVENS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. I have had an opportunity to read letters written by Mr. E. M. House, and at no place does he sign his name "Col. E. M. House," and I believe that should be significant. It is my desire, however, to have the remainder of this report retained in the Record for I believe it may make better Americans out of the so-called Anglophiles.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield right there? Who wrote it anyway? What is the use putting something in if we do not know who wrote it?

Mr. THORKELSON. Because the substantive matter of the letter itself deals with facts. For instance, in one part of the letter it mentions that a number of officers in our own Army and Navy were decorated by the British Government. I have looked that up.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is a matter of history, is it not?

Mr. THORKELSON. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why put it in the Record again?

Mr. THORKELSON. I find that much of the substantive matter in this letter is authenticated, but for the sake of sparing someone's feelings, for the sake of eliminating the name of Col. E. M. House, I shall give you the real E. M. House who worked with Wilson.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But he is not responsible for this letter, is he?

Mr. THORKELSON. I do not know if he is responsible for this letter or not. It was printed by the Washington Publishing Co.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKELSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. You say you are leaving the address and name off the letter? Was the item in parentheses that is printed in the letter a part of the original letter?

Mr. THORKELSON. You mean the heading of it?

Mr. MILLER. No; the item in parentheses.

Mr. THORKELSON. No. That is the publisher's notation.

Mr. MILLER. I just wanted to ask this one question. Certainly there is no personal feeling. Do you not think, knowing all the existing circumstances, now that you have agreed to ask unanimous consent to withdraw the name of Col. E. M. House and the title, in all fairness, you should go the whole way and take the letter out?

Mr. THORKELSON. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In view of the fact it is going to cost the Government \$600—the gentleman says it is a matter of history, anyway—

Mr. THORKELSON. If the gentleman will excuse me, we have spent about \$13,000,000,000 this year and are now \$1,000,000,000 in the red as a result of the first 3 months' operations of this year, which indicates a probable increased debt of \$5,000,000,000 or \$6,000,000,000 by the end of the fiscal year, I say if we can spend \$300 and awaken the American people to what is happening in this country it is money well spent—money spent for a worthy purpose.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But the gentleman says all this information is now in the possession of the public. Why not save a little? We never can get them to cut off \$1,000,000 or \$1,000,000,000 at a time, but we can save in these lesser ways.

Mr. THORKELSON. If it is a question of the \$300, I would be glad to write a check for it and give it to the Government Printing Office.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Coming from a Congressman, I doubt if it would be a proper contribution.

Mr. THORKELSON. I think it would be perfectly proper for a Congressman to share the expenses of Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But the gentleman can save the same amount by just withdrawing that. He would be ahead \$300 himself.

Mr. THORKELSON. I choose not to withdraw it, because there are facts in that letter.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I hope the gentleman will not insist on my yielding now but will let me finish reading my manuscript. At its conclusion I shall be pleased to yield to any question, and I shall try to answer him. I want to tell the gentleman something about Mr. House. This information may be found in this book written by a former Assistant Attorney General. This book is to be found in the Library. Its title is "Woodrow Wilson, Disciple of Revolution."

Mr. THOMASON. Will not the gentleman yield for a brief question right there?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. THOMASON. I hold no brief for the late Colonel House, for I believe his name and fame will live long after many of us are forgotten. My principal interest right now is in the preservation of an honest, truthful CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Now that the House letter has been, I think, proven to be a spurious document by the letters I placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 333, in extension of my remarks, does not the gentleman feel that in justice to himself and his colleagues in this House and to a truthful RECORD that the entire letter ought to be expunged? Because, if the gentleman will recall, he said when he referred to that letter and the signer of it that it was the Col. E. M. House who was the intimate friend and associate of the late President Wilson. So, in the interest of fairness and justice, not only to a dead man but to an honest RECORD, does not the gentleman think that letter should be expunged from the RECORD?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Let me say to the gentleman from Texas that I believe the letter was signed "Col. E. M. House," Edward M. House, the friend of President Wilson, never signed his name "Col. E. M. House." This is supposed to be a report that came from the British secret files, and I do not believe that the House who was adviser to President Wilson ever was engaged by Great Britain and sitting in the British consulate. It must therefore have been someone else.

The reason I want to have that letter in the RECORD is because I want the American people to know what the British think of us. I want to have that letter in the RECORD to give that information to the American people so they will not be so foolish as to fall for this British propaganda that is saturating the United States today just like it did in 1916 and 1917.

Mr. THOMASON. Do I understand the gentleman's alibi now to be that he is—

Mr. THORKEKELSON. The gentleman has no alibi.

Mr. THOMASON. Does the gentleman now admit—

Mr. THORKEKELSON. The gentleman does not admit anything.

Mr. THOMASON. That it is not the Col. Edward M. House whom the gentleman from Connecticut spoke of in such high admiration yesterday? Does the gentleman now admit that he is not the man who wrote that letter? If so, I say that in all fairness the letter should be expunged from this RECORD.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I never said that this Colonel House was the Edward M. House, President Wilson's adviser. As a matter of fact, I said "Disregard both the writer and the recipient of the letter."

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I admit that British propaganda is being spread in this country today just as it was prior to our entrance into the World War. If this be so, why is the gentleman now swallowing the British propaganda and supporting the repeal of the arms embargo, something which British propaganda is trying to get us to do?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. May I reply that I am opposed to the repeal of the arms embargo, and I am also opposed to the never-ending supply of British propaganda urging its repeal.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER. I understood the gentleman to say that the letter he put in the RECORD signed "Col. E. M. House" did not purport to be the Colonel House of the Wilson administration.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I said, "Do not take the writer into consideration. Do not consider the origin of the letter, but read the substance of it." I said that in my remarks. There was no reason to assume that it was the Edward M. House who was connected with the Wilson administration. I do not know who it was. My letter was inserted in the RECORD for one purpose alone, and that was to give information to the American people. I think they are entitled to it.

Mr. THOMASON. May I ask one more question? Did not the gentleman say the other day in response to my question that it was the Col. E. M. House, the friend and intimate of Woodrow Wilson? The gentleman said that, and the daily RECORD will show it.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Well, look the daily RECORD up.

Mr. Speaker, I may say at this time that the part of the report which refers to the decorations bestowed upon a number of American officers is correct, and so stated in Whitaker's Almanack of 1919 and 1920. Reference is also made to this, as the report states, in the New York Times, August 15, 1918. So this part of the report is authentic, and evidence may be found in the Congressional Library.

It is my desire to call my colleagues' attention to this supplementary paragraph attached to that report, which I shall not contradict:

This was 20 years ago. Is it any wonder our Congressmen promise the people one thing and then go to Washington and do something entirely different? Things in the United States are far worse today than when this document was written, and each set of candidates we put in office helps just that much more to sell out this country to the internationalists.

For further proof of this plot read the book, Woodrow Wilson—Disciple of Revolution, by Colonel in the United States Army and Assistant United States Attorney General until 1933, Jennings C. Wise. Six hundred and seventy-four pages of hitherto unpublished truths of the goings on behind the scenes of government and not generally known.

This secret-service report, as it is called, was printed by the American Publishing Society in 1938, I believe, and no doubt they have good reason for printing it and further substantiation. Issue has been taken to the use of the date 1937 in a parenthetical editor's note in the report.

The author of Woodrow Wilson—Disciple of Revolution is a well-known writer whose record is listed in Who's Who in America. He served in various capacities in the United States Government and was Assistant Attorney General. He also holds the Distinguished Service Cross.

The papers have criticized me for incorporating this secret-service report in the RECORD, and my colleagues here in the House for inserting it as it was printed, with names attached. May I ask the Members to understand that I do not resent criticism of any sort, for in criticizing I must expect to be criticized. However, inasmuch as I seem to be a victim of circumstances, and as I have mentioned a Mr. House, I shall now give you a synopsis of Mr. Edward M. House, as set forth in Woodrow Wilson—Disciple of Revolution. I suggest that you read this book. You may not be so gullible after reading it and so willing to defend anyone's character until you actually know whereof you speak:

Among the internationalists there were, as shown, Democrats of eminence, as well as Republicans, just as in the case of the pacifists. The former included Col. Edward M. House, of Texas, who owed his title to service on the Governor's staff. His father had emigrated from England and been prominent in the Texas revolution. A man of some affluence, with a taste for politics, and known in Texas as "a silent worker . . ." It was during his stay in Texas that he wrote his first book, a political romance entitled "Philip Dru: Administrator." The character of it is significant—the story of a young West Point graduate who made himself dictator of the United States, rescinded the Constitution, reformed the currency, enacted labor laws providing for workmen's compensation, abolished the tariff, and placed the courts under his personal control. The colonel admitted that his hero was a Socialist of the Blanc school, while no one can read the book without seeing the influence it had exerted upon his views.

The author of this strange novel was shrewder than the "apostle of peace." He had seen the trend of events and had, in some way, broken into the sanctum sanctorum of the internationalists, whose

whole scheme seems to have been disclosed to him. In consequence, he made Dru, as American premier, lead the United States into a league of nations similar to that which Marburg had in mind, a league in which the supreme council possessed the power not only to regulate the domestic affairs of the constituent states but to enforce universal peace. As finally published (1913), the book seems to have developed progressively with political developments in America. Starting off in a socialistic key to catch the ear of Bryan, it passed to a parliamentary refrain for Wilson and then into an internationalistic chorus for Carnegie and Marburg. It seems plain why its publication was long withheld by House. In 1911 House was not yet prepared to abandon Bryan, nor was he prepared, until after Wilson's election, to sponsor a league of nations.

So, too, in the compendious compilation of House's papers by Seymour, obviously also nothing more than an autobiography, since it is admitted in the preface that it was written with House's aid; House unhesitatingly confessed that it was his purpose, in 1911, so to transform the Democratic Party through its next President as to effect a virtual revolution in the American Government. Not only that, but it was to be "socialized and internationalized."

Colonel House, as well as Marburg, was an inveterate internationalist, and he was determined that the next President should be a Democratic internationalist with dictatorial and socialistic tendencies, and a low-tariff advocate. He met Woodrow Wilson in 1911 and asked him to speak at the Texas fair that year.

In March, House wrote Wilson that he had Texas in good shape, and in April he returned to New York satisfied that he could deliver the delegation.

Woodrow Wilson was elected on November 4, 1912, by about two-thirds majority, and the Republican Party was split. On November 15, 1912, Wilson sailed for Bermuda, and until his departure House never let him far out of his sight. It is interesting to read this book, as it deals in detail with the inner happenings of Wilson's administration. I can only say it is a vast accumulation of double dealing and intrigue, led by Colonel House himself:

Before the new year House began holding conferences with the great bankers, with Wilson's consent on the proposed currency and tariff acts, selecting GLASS as the proponent of the measure. According to House, GLASS declared he knew nothing about currency matters, whereupon House undertook to coach him. House's plan, despite all protests, was to rush the Federal Reserve Act through Congress before all the patronage had been disposed of. * * *

House's part in the internationalist project, however, precluded the possibility of his holding office. On the other hand, the part he was playing was important enough. For when his authority to speak for the President in a certain important matter was challenged, Wilson said: "Mr. House is my second personality. He is my independent self. His thoughts and mine are one. If I were in his place I would do just as he suggested. * * * If anyone thinks he is reflecting my opinion by whatever he states, they are welcome to the conclusion." Thereupon Collier's Weekly gave House the title of Wilson's "silent partner." * * * (pp. 111-112).

There is little merit in the contention of some of Wilson's unreasoning adherents that the veracity of House is questionable, and that he was in reality no more than a vain little "yes man" to his chief. That he was at least as often leader as he was follower is plentifully evident from the virtual autobiography brought out under the title of *The Real Colonel House*, by his literary agent in 1918 during the Presidency of Wilson. In that book it is frankly stated that House's purpose from the first was to so transform the Democratic Party as to permit a virtual revolution in our form of government. Moreover, Philip Dru: Administrator, representing House's ideas prior to his first meeting with Wilson, was permitted to come out almost contemporaneously with Wilson's own *New Freedom*. The fact that Wilson was completely cognizant of these literary activities on the part of House, and that they continued to be close friends and allies thereafter, is evidence enough of House's real status and of Wilson's sympathy therewith.

It is hardly to be denied that it was House who brought Morgenthau, Elkus, Baruch, Rabbi Wise, and Morris into the Wilson camp. These powerful men were not of the type to deal with understrappers. * * * (p. 113).

On March 6 the Cabinet held its first regular meeting. Houston, like Page, deemed it a mediocre body. Wilson declared at once that he proposed to devote himself to the "graver problems" of the Nation. No one present doubted that he had already formulated his major policies.

After the meeting Wilson laughed and joked with the "silent partner" about the Cabinet, describing the peculiarities of each of its members. A secret but readily decipherable code was now adopted. McCombs was designated as Damon, McAdoo as Pythias, Bryan as Primus, McReynolds as Coke, and Lane as Demosthenes.

It is one of the strangest facts in the life of Wilson, distrustful and suspicious though he was by nature, that he had not yet fathomed House's true character. He was, apparently, wholly unconscious of the fact that, though the constitutional Chief Executive of the American people, he was delegating his judgment, if not his

authority, at least in part, to another. He seems to have been as guileless as the world at large in accepting House at his own valuation (pp. 121-122).

In 1913 the British and the American oil companies were jockeying for position and control of the Mexican oil field. Wilson wanted Huerta and England had supported Diaz. Japan also seemed to be interested in the Mexican squabble and in treaties on immigration to the United States. The Secretary of State, Mr. Bryan, evidently did not have free action in regard to foreign affairs, for Mr. Houston made this observation:

Because it clearly indicated the President was going to be his own Secretary of State.

It was this attitude on the President's part that caused considerable misunderstanding and dissension in his Cabinet.

This book clearly reveals that Mr. House was opposed to the appointment of a Nationalist to any position. He was, instead, always in favor of the internationalist—so it is no wonder that we gradually slipped into the hands of the invisible government.

In 1913 House was sent over to England as President Wilson's personal representative. On meeting the British Foreign Secretary, Sir Edward Grey, he informed him:

That President Wilson was now convinced that the Panama Act violated the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty and that he intended to use all his influence to secure its repeal. The matter, the American urged, was a difficult one, since it would be necessary to persuade Congress to pass a law acknowledging its mistake (p. 140).

I mention this so that the Members of Congress may know how they are valued by the roving ambassadors.

House also discussed the matter of a League of Nations with Grey. Wilson might render Britain a very great service should Germany assail the Triple Entente. The upshot was that Sir Edward Grey expressed his willingness to leave the Panama matter to Wilson, so far as was in his power. "Thus," says Page's biographer, "from July 3, 1913, there was a complete understanding between the British Government and the Washington administration on the question of the tolls. * * *" (p. 140).

This meant that Mr. House obligated our help to the Triple Entente in case of war with the Triple Alliance. It is also well to bear in mind that if the truth were known a similar obligation may be in the making today. It is for that reason that I have advocated the retention of the Neutrality Act based upon arms embargo and repeal of all power granted to the President. It is the only way in which we may remain neutral.

Almost coincident with the dedication of the Peace Palace, Eliot began to urge stronger methods than arbitration. He, too, was in favor of enforcing peace in one way and another. But apparently he made no more impression upon Wilson and House than Page. Determined to press their own scheme, House, unknown to Bryan, opened negotiations on September 1 with Dumba, the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador, to determine if the dual monarchy, Germany's greatest ally, would abandon the central alliance for such a league of nations as that suggested 2 days before by Carnegie at The Hague. House and Wilson were not dealing frankly with either Bryan or Page, while seeking by roundabout methods to detach Britain from Japan, and Franz Joseph from the Kaiser, and to compel the Czar to institute those democratic reforms in Russia demanded by the American Jews and the internationalists generally.

Both the Kaiser and the Czar's government now perceived Wilson's real purpose. So, too, as one proposal of Philip Dru after another translated itself into legislation, did the press come to recognize the silent partner as the author of the book. "Whatever the book had said should be had come true," wrote Lane. "In the end Wilson had come to be Philip Dru."

Despite his belittlement by the press, Bryan had, with surprising patience, overlooked up to this time the usurpation of his functions by House. But when the silent partner undertook to dictate the Federal Reserve Banking Act, Bryan felt betrayed by a man who seemed to him to represent the interests as well as the internationalists. Thoroughly alarmed at the forces behind Wilson, and distrusting utterly the finally identified author of Philip Dru, the Great Commoner threatened openly in October to resign.

"I am afraid we have come to the parting of the ways," remarked Wilson despairingly to Tumulty (pp. 144-145).

Mr. House's visit to England and Tyrrell's visit to the United States finally terminated in an Anglo-American understanding in 1913.

Before Tyrrell left Washington it was agreed between him and House, that after the repeal of the Panama Act, House should, as

Wilson's representative, proceed direct to Berlin and urge the Kaiser, over the heads of Von Tirpitz and the naval party, to accept Churchill's proposals and the principle of the League of Nations. House was now to deal direct with all the Ambassadors (p. 150).

It is my desire to call your attention to the fact that at this time there was no ill-feeling toward Germany, either by President Wilson or Mr. House. On January 4, 1914, Mr. E. M. House sent the following letter to Mr. Page:

DEAR PAGE: * * * Benj. Ide Wheeler took lunch with me the other day. He is just back from Germany, and he is on the most intimate terms with the Kaiser. He tells me he often takes dinner with the family alone and spends the evening with them.

I know, now, the different Cabinet officials who have the Kaiser's confidence, and I know his attitude toward England, naval armaments, war, and world politics in general.

Wheeler spoke to me very frankly, and the information he gave me will be invaluable in the event that my plans carry. The general idea is to bring about a sympathetic understanding between England, Germany, and America, not only upon the question of disarmament, but upon other matters of equal importance to themselves and to the world at large.

It seems to me that Japan should come into this pact, but Wheeler tells me that the Kaiser feels very strongly upon the question of Asiatics. He thinks the contest of the future will be between the eastern and western civilizations. * * *

Your friend always,

E. M. HOUSE (p. 152).

Well might Page have been alarmed. He could not fail to see the dangerous character of the vain and ambitious schemer whom Wilson had made his "silent partner." Constantly stressing the idea of world leadership by Wilson, and thus flattering the President's vanity, Page deemed House a positive menace to the country. Yet the more earnestly he sought to discourage Wilson from becoming a party to House's schemes, the more objectionable he became to the President (p. 153).

House accomplished nothing by his visits to Europe except to alarm such countries in which he called.

Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, the British Ambassador at Washington, subsequently declared that House's visits back and forth to London and Berlin had so alarmed the militarists of Germany that they took advantage of the Kaiser's absence on his annual cruise in Norwegian waters to project the strife in which they saw their only salvation (p. 178).

Yet in 1932, when a press photograph showed Franklin D. Roosevelt, just returned from his nomination in Chicago, conferring with House at the latter's Beverley home, the author of Philip Dru, Administrator, proclaimed the Presidential nominee a more suitable leader for a new American revolution than even Woodrow Wilson had been.

In any event, Woodrow Wilson called, in 1917, not merely for the liberalization of existing governments, but for the democratization of the whole world. The least enlightened peoples, the least advanced political societies, were summoned to enlist under his banner, to make the world safe for democracy.

Whatever that oft-repeated phrase meant to Wilson, we need have no doubt that to his alter ego it implied one thing—revolution (p. 639).

The prophecy of Philip Dru, Administrator, written by Colonel House, has practically come true, and may I suggest that my colleagues read appendix C (ibid. p. 569). It is very interesting because the present administration is following out House's plan.

Mr. Speaker, in order to present these facts without interruption, may I ask unanimous consent to extend the secret report of the Balfour declaration in the RECORD?

BALFOUR DECLARATION—SECRET FACTS REVEALED

(Important and hitherto unpublished sidelights on the Balfour declaration are for the first time revealed in the series of articles by Mr. S. Landman, the first of which appears below. From 1915 until 1918 Mr. Landman acted as private secretary to Mr. N. Sokolow, now president of the Zionist Organization. He was also secretary of the World Zionist Organization from the opening of the London office at the end of 1917 until 1922.)

WORLD JEWRY—SECRET HISTORY OF THE BALFOUR DECLARATION (March 1, 1935—Continued from last week—By S. Landman)

It was about the end of 1916 that James Malcolm, through Leopold Greenberg, first came into contact with Dr. Weizmann. This memorable interview took place at Dr. Weizmann's house in Addison Road. Dr. Weizmann had moved from Manchester to London in that year and was working on explosives for the Admiralty and the Ministry of Munitions. As is well known he had invented an important process for the manufacture of acetone and this had brought him into contact with Lloyd George, the Minister of Munitions, and Mr. Balfour, the First Lord of the Admiralty. In this talk with Malcolm Dr. Weizmann confessed his disappointment that his efforts to win over Lloyd George and Balfour to the Zionist cause had apparently made no progress, and he asked Malcolm what reason he (Malcolm) had for being convinced of success.

Malcolm reported to him the conversations he had had with Sir Mark Sykes and the War Cabinet's authority for his (Malcolm's) overtures to the Zionists. Dr. Weizmann's doubts were still strong, and he asked when he could see Sir Mark Sykes. "At once, I believe," replied Malcolm, and he rang up Sir Mark, informed him that he was speaking from Dr. Weizmann's house, and asked for an appointment to bring Dr. Weizmann to him. Sir Mark fixed one for the next day, but Dr. Weizmann was prevented from going and Sokolow went instead. The interview was very successful, both parties making the best impression on each other. Further interviews took place, at which Dr. Weizmann was also present. Of course, all these interviews took place with the full knowledge and approval of Sir Maurice Hankey, the secretary of the war cabinet.

MR. G. H. FITZMAURICE

There was another man—an Irishman—who rendered most valuable service at this time to the bringing together of the Zionists and the British Government. This was Mr. G. H. Fitzmaurice, a great friend of Malcolm. Fitzmaurice had spent many years in the British Embassy in Constantinople, and was very well versed in all the problems of the Near East. Malcolm had at a very early stage discussed with him the possibilities of effecting a rapprochement between the Jews, especially in the United States of America and other neutral countries, and the British and allied cause. Fitzmaurice was finally won over and became a very devoted friend of Zionism. I first made his acquaintance about the middle of 1917, and I can say with confidence that he was one of the earliest and most discerning of our friends. I remember him saying to me in 1918: "A nation which has a Rothschild and an Einstein must win through * * *." He was, like Sykes, a devout Catholic, and amongst his intimate friends were Sir Henry Wilson and General Macdonogh, director of military operations, whom he won over to the Jewish cause. It was Fitzmaurice chiefly who helped to open for Sokolow the doors of the Vatican, with the result that the Pope granted Sokolow an audience in 1917 and thereby indicated that the Vatican was favorably disposed to the idea of Palestine for the Jews. It is of interest to record that the Zionist leaders had previously held the view that there was no way of winning the sympathy of the Vatican or of such men as Sir Mark Sykes, because they were Catholics. It is the great achievement of Malcolm that he was not only able to convince them of the justice of the Zionist cause, but even to enlist their active support.

After an understanding had been arrived at between Sir Mark Sykes and Weizmann and Sokolow, it was resolved to send a secret message to Justice Brandeis that the British Cabinet would help the Jews to gain Palestine in return for active Jewish sympathy and support in the United States for the allied cause so as to bring about a radical pro-Ally tendency in the United States. This message was sent in cipher through the Foreign Office. One of the principal under secretaries at the Foreign Office at that time was Sir Ronald Graham. He was in the confidence of Sir Mark Sykes, and during the whole time he was at the Foreign Office he was of unfailing help to the Zionists. Secret messages were also sent to the Zionist leaders in Russia to hearten them and obtain their support for the Allied cause, which was being affected by Russian ill-treatment of the Jews. Messages were also sent to Jewish leaders in neutral countries and the result was to strengthen the pro-Ally sympathies of Jews everywhere.

Through General Macdonogh, who was won over by Fitzmaurice, Dr. Weizmann was able about this time to secure from the Government the service of half a dozen younger Zionists for active work on behalf of Zionism. At that time conscription was in force and only those who were engaged in work of national importance could be released from active service at the front. I remember Dr. Weizmann writing a letter to General Macdonogh and invoking his assistance in obtaining the exemption from active service of Leon Simon, Harry Sacher, Simon Marks, Hyamson Tolowsky, and myself. At Dr. Weizmann's request I was transferred from the War Office (M. I. 9), where I was then working, to the Ministry of Propaganda, which was under Lord Northcliffe, and later to the Zionist office, where I commenced work about December 1918. Simon Marks actually arrived at the office in khaki and immediately set about the task of organizing the office, which, as will be easily understood, had to maintain constant communication with Zionists in most countries.

GOVERNMENT HELP

From that time onward for several years Zionism was considered an ally of the British Government, and every help and assistance was forthcoming from each Government department. Passport or travel difficulties did not exist when a man was recommended by our office. For instance, a certificate signed by me was accepted by the home office at that time as evidence that an Ottoman Jew was to be treated as a friendly alien and not as an enemy, which was the case with the Turkish subjects.

After Sir Mark Sykes had established contact with the Zionist leaders, it was resolved to have a more formal meeting so that one of the Zionist leaders could be officially appointed to act on behalf of the Zionist movement. This meeting took place on February 7, 1917, at the house of Dr. Gaster, who had already been in touch with Sir Mark and Sir Herbert Samuel, with reference to Zionism. Sir Herbert Samuel, James de Rothschild, Sokolow, Tchenow, and Dr. Weizmann were the principal Zionists who attended there to meet Sir Mark Sykes. The result of the meeting was that Sokolow was chosen to act as Zionist representative and to negotiate with Sir Mark. Dr. Weizmann was, at that time, too fully occupied with his chemical work for the Government.

SOKOLOW IN PARIS

The plan of action decided upon by Sir Mark Sykes and Sokolow was for Sokolow to go to France and Italy and make sure there was no opposition. In the meantime Dr. Weizmann would continue to win friends in England. In connection with the visit of Sokolow to Paris, Malcolm again rendered immense service to the Zionist cause. As a member of the Armenian National Delegation, he was personally acquainted with the leading French officials in charge of near eastern affairs—especially M. Gout, M. Picot, and M. de Margerie. They were the three key men for the Zionist purpose. Malcolm went first alone to M. Picot and prepared the way for Sokolow. Sokolow had previously tried to invoke the assistance of French Jewry in getting an audience from the French Government. He had not been successful. The Alliance Israelite used every effort to dissuade him from talking Zionism to the Ministers. Even Baron Edmond de Rothschild, the devoted friend of Palestine and the Zionist leaders, could not very well ask the French Government to depart in favor of England from its traditional role of protector of the peoples of the Near East. The position was such that Sokolow doubted very much whether he would be given an audience at the Quai d'Orsay. With the help of Malcolm, however, all the difficulties were overcome and the leaders of French Jewry, to their intense amazement and annoyance, read in *Le Temps* that M. Sokolow had been received by M. Pichon, the Foreign Minister. Not only that, but they found M. Sokolow had actually been invited to stay to lunch. M. Jacques Bigart and M. Sylvain Levi, both of the Alliance Israelite, telephoned to M. Sokolow's hotel to make sure they had heard aright, and finished up by inviting Sokolow themselves.

I have from Malcolm an interesting story of Sokolow's first interview with M. Picot. The latter was, of course, sizing up the man with whom he had to deal, and at the very end, when helping M. Sokolow on with his coat, he said as though it was of minor importance: "By the way, M. Sokolow, may I ask you one more question? Which Government would the Jews prefer to have in Palestine, the English or the French?" Sokolow was, however, quite ready with a reply. "You embarrass me, M. Picot," he answered. "I feel rather like the child who is asked whom do you love more, your mother or your father."

M. Picot was delighted with this reply, which seemed to him worthy of the best French diplomacy.

From Paris, Sokolow left for Rome. There, thanks to the introductions of Fitzmaurice and Malcolm on the one hand and the help of Baron Sidney Soncino on the other, everything was prepared for him. The audience with the Pope was quickly arranged and also interviews with the leading officials of the Foreign Office. The return to London of Sokolow found Dr. Weizmann and his small band of helpers in the throes of a mighty struggle with Anglo-Jewish leaders. Just as the leading French Jews tried hard to keep Zionism away from their Government, so did the leading Anglo-Jews do their utmost to keep Zionism away from the British Government. Edwin Montague was a leading opponent and remained such all his life. Lord Swaythling (the son of the first Lord Swaythling) was equally vehement in his opposition. Eleven of them joined forces in a letter to the *Times* about May 1917, protesting against Zionist aims and objects. Sir Mark Sykes informed us that something must be done to impress the Cabinet, and the Zionist leaders were compelled to take up the challenge. It was absolutely essential to convince the Cabinet that Anglo-Jewry was Zionist in sympathy and outlook, in view of the constant denial of this, which they heard from the leading Jews.

A rapid campaign among the members of the Jewish Board of Deputies was organized, and when it was seen that a majority was obtainable a pro-Zionist resolution was introduced and carried by a majority against the wishes and speeches of the president, David Alexander, K. C., and other honorary officers. The president and Mr. Henriques resigned, thus leaving the field clear for the Zionists.

THE DECLARATION

In the meantime, the text of the declaration was being prepared. The text submitted by the Zionists was, of course, more far-reaching than the final text. On the other hand, Lucien Wolf had some time before suggested to the Zionists a text which was pale and colorless. I cannot recollect the exact words, but it was to the effect that if Palestine came under the British sphere of influence Jews should be given no less right to colonize it than anybody else. If this text had been acceptable, it could have gone forward in the name of Anglo-Jewry. Naturally, the Zionist leaders could not accept it, and nothing more was heard of it. Mr. Ormsby-Gore was of great assistance throughout this stage as a link with Mr. Balfour. It is correct to say that the text of the declaration had to satisfy many conflicting claims. The Anglo-Jewish leaders were apprehensive lest a Jewish Palestine should affect their civic rights here, and all were also genuinely concerned for the Arab inhabitants of Palestine.

The opposition of Anglo-Jewry was still considerable, and the Cabinet could not see a way through the impasse. It was eventually decided to send the draft of the declaration to several leading Jews and obtain their opinions.

Through the help of Sir Mark Sykes, three of these letters were sent to Zionists or Zionist sympathizers. Three were sent to anti-Zionists. There were thus three against three, and everything depended on the seventh or decisive letter. This was Dr. Hertz, and his reply was emphatic and favorable.

This brought us to the autumn of 1917, when all was ready for the issue of the declaration. But the Cabinet was too preoccupied with

the anxieties of the Great War, which was absorbing every ounce of their strength and every moment of their time.

Meeting after meeting passed, and the item of Palestine on the agenda of the Cabinet was not reached.

Finally, at the beginning of November, Sir Mark Sykes came out of the Cabinet room very excited, exclaiming, "It's a boy." Thus was born the famous Balfour declaration, the greatest event in Jewish history for centuries.

At a meeting of Zionists held immediately afterward, Sokolow said they must celebrate this declaration with such solemnity that it would be impossible to forget it. The text was cabled through the war office and foreign office to the Jews in the remotest corners of the earth. Sheafs of cables were taken by us to the war office for this purpose.

Many heads, hearts, and hands combined to bring the Balfour Declaration into existence. The share of the British Cabinet and the Zionist leaders is already well known. It is only just that the efforts of other non-Jewish friends, such as Malcolm and Fitzmaurice, should be known and appreciated.

Is it not strange that there are two Justices on the Supreme Bench, one of whom is mentioned in the pamphlet *Communism in the American Labor Movement* as a member of the Civil Liberties Union, and the other one in the Balfour report as being directly connected with shaping the destinies of the United States so that she would enter the war in Europe—both of them active in belligerent movements. Yet their own organizations have turned around and passed a resolution in 1936 which I shall now read:

The Central Conference of American Rabbis reaffirms its conviction that conscientious objection to military service is in accordance with the highest interpretation of Judaism and therefore petitions the Government of the United States to grant to Jewish religious conscientious objectors to war the same exemption from military service as has long been granted to members of the Society of Friends and similar religious organizations.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that positive evidence, in my judgment, has been produced that the letter which the gentleman from Montana introduced into the *RECORD* last Friday, October 13, purporting to be signed by Col. E. M. House, was not as a matter of fact signed by Col. Edward M. House. I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be expunged from the *RECORD*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what has the gentleman from Montana got to say about that?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. The gentleman from Montana has said all he is going to say. I said to delete the names on the letter and delete the address.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman agreeable to this request?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I am agreeable to having the name of the purported signer of the letter removed, and I am agreeable to having the address on the letter, the British Consulate, removed and the addressee's name removed, but let the body of the letter stand in the *RECORD* as it is.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, my unanimous-consent request is that in view of the fact the letter has been proven to be spurious and the gentleman from Montana now does not claim that the late Col. Edward M. House, who was the intimate and associate of the late Woodrow Wilson, signed it, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter, in view of its falsity, be expunged from the *RECORD*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON]?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that is just exactly why it ought to stay in—because it is not the Edward M. House that was associated with President Wilson. I never said it was, and that is the reason I want the letter left in the *RECORD*.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in view of the circumstances, I object at this time.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN] may address the House for 20 minutes on next Wednesday, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the so-called House letter, I ask unanimous consent that everything except the contents in the body of the letter be expunged from the RECORD.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to read this wire here.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to make an objection, but hereafter, in view of the attitude of the gentleman from Montana, I will be forced to object to extensions of his remarks which include statements of others unless we know who signed them and whether or not he vouches for their authenticity.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I may say to the gentleman that I will reserve the same right for myself. There are many articles that go into the RECORD which are taken from newspapers. May I say that most of the remarks I put in the RECORD are my own remarks. This is practically the first time I have used somebody else's remarks. You can look up the RECORD and see that that is the fact. That is more than the gentleman can claim.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. What happened to my unanimous-consent request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] asks unanimous consent that everything except the contents of the House letter be expunged from the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, unless somebody is going to vouch for the authorship of those remarks, and admit that Col. E. M. House, late of the Wilson administration, is not the author, we should know who the author of the remarks is.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Will the gentleman let me read this wire here?

Mr. THOMASON. If the gentleman will say who the wire is from and will vouch for its genuineness to an extent greater than in the case of the House letter, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER]?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. If the request is granted, the substance contained in the body of the letter will remain, and it will show that Col. E. M. House was not connected with the writing of the letter.

Mr. THOMASON. I would like to know who the author is.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. We will find that out later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER]?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know whether it would fix up the RECORD if you simply strike the name "Col. E. M. House" from this letter. What preceded that, and what were the reasons for putting it in?

I do not believe you can make an honest record and leave this letter in at all. I wish the gentleman from Wisconsin would withdraw his request; otherwise I shall have to object to it.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In view of the statement just made, I withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker, in order that this matter can be cleared up satisfactorily at a later date.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection to the reading of the telegram. I do not want to keep any-

thing out of the record that is genuine and authentic. It is only the forged documents I want to keep out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Montana will be permitted to read the telegram.

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. The telegram is as follows:

That letter signed Colonel House was originally published in 1919. Author was Dr. William J. Maloney, distinguished New York neurologist who was active in Irish Nationalist affairs. Later appeared anonymously with suggestion author was Sir William Wiseman, then British intelligence representative, now with Kuhn, Loeb. Colonel House's name did not figure and must have been added recently by Bremerton people in stupid move quite incongruous with letter's brilliance and insight. Document received publicity 10 years ago and Maloney swore to his authorship before Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, subcommittee under Senator Shortridge, January 11, 1930. Testimony appears on page 569 of committee hearings. If Library of Congress does not have early editions of Maloney's pamphlet available, friend of mine in Washington has copy you could see. Maloney lives in New York. Am sending you this information assuming you will prefer to make correction before your critics do. Maloney's pamphlet so valuable that publicity can only do good, but Colonel House's name should be disassociated.

Mr. THOMASON. Who signed it?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Seward Collins sent this wire. This wire is evidently in relation to this letter. It has already come up before the Senate committee. It is already on record.

Mr. THOMASON. Who is the man who sent this telegram?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Seward Collins.

Mr. THOMASON. Who is he?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. How do I know?

Mr. THOMASON. All right.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THORKEKELSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a history of the Italian cheese industry in the United States, this being a brief which was filed before the Federal Trade Commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PUT AMERICA ON A CASH-AND-CARRY BASIS BEFORE WE LOSE OUR SHIRTS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the subject of my address this afternoon is Put America on a Cash-and-Carry Basis Before We Lose Our Shirts. There is a phrase going about these days that causes one to stop and think about the affairs of our own country as well as the war in Europe. This phrase is "cash and carry." Right here I want to quote from the speech of the President in Pittsburgh on October 19, 1932. I quote:

The credit of the family depends chiefly on whether that family is living within its income. And that is equally true of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good.

I cannot finish this quotation because all the Democrats are leaving. If they are all going out and do not want to hear this quotation—well, the majority leader says he will stay, and if he will stay, I will go on. [Laughter.] He is a prince of good fellows. I will have at least one Democrat here to hear me finish this quotation.

If it lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily at reasonable rates. But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending; if it extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, then it is on the road to bankruptcy.

That was a sound statement of the President of the United States, and he does make some sound statements. He made that one before he was elected in 1932. He has forgotten it, however.

Mr. Speaker, our Government has been off the cash-and-carry basis. For 8 long years we have been on a borrow-and-spend basis, but our borrowing days will soon be over if we do not heed the warning signs that are apparent on every side.

In the first 95 days of the current fiscal year our Treasury Department reports expenditures exceeding receipts by over \$1,000,000,000. By October 14—105 days after the year began—we had spent \$1,204,043,875.83, according to Mr. Morgenthau's Treasury Department statement, more than we received. By the end of this year I predict we will be over \$4,000,000,000 in the red. It is a terrible situation, Mr. Majority Leader, a horrible situation we find ourselves in at this time.

Do you not think we should have "cash and carry" in Government?

United States bonds for the first time in nearly 20 years have recently sold in the market below par. The money changers can no longer carry the load; and unless the Government gets on a cash-and-carry basis, the bottom will drop out of our inflated credit market some day soon and carry with it the whole financial structure of our Government and our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Benjamin Franklin once said, "It is hard for an empty sack to stand upright." In the last year, to cover up the growing deficits as reflected by the national debt, the Treasury Department has resorted to digging into the cash balances in the general fund. These have been depleted by more than \$700,000,000 in the past 12 months.

We should have taxes and cash, not notes and debts—debts created for our grandchildren to pay. It is not honest, it is not fair, it is not just. All the money we have collected from employers and employees alike to provide social security for our people has likewise gone up the spout in the mad scramble to substitute securities for cash wherever it is possible in the financial operations of our Government; and when this social-security cash was spent, the I O U's, issued in the form of securities, were again sold to the people or listed as assets by various governmental agencies as the frenzied financing goes on; but Franklin also warned that "always taking out of the meal box and never putting in soon comes to the bottom." There will surely come a time when these Government I O U's will be unacceptable to the people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if cash and carry is a good principle to apply to the sale of munitions to foreign belligerents in the present European war, it ought to be a good principle to apply to the operations of our Government now; and, Mr. Majority Leader, if it is wise to have the cash-and-carry principle applied to the sales of munitions to foreign governments, it is good, Mr. Majority Leader, that that apply now in the operation of our Government.

We ought to set our own house in order before we set out to help the world in another venture on the western front. We marched up to the western front in 1918, but it cost our people over \$40,000,000,000, and is costing them millions and hundreds of millions of dollars each year now for that terrible catastrophe, and all we got out of this adventure was a war boom that was followed by the greatest depression this country has even known.

We have tried to borrow and spend our way out of that depression for almost 7 years, without even making a dent in it. The tax burden, Federal, State, and local, has increased until enterprise has been stifled, and home ownership has become a luxury only to be enjoyed by the ultra rich, and the selected few who live in houses either built or subsidized with money collected from other home owners and taxpayers.

Coupled with our adventures into the international economic field, through our trade-agreement policy that is reciprocal only in that it breaks down the wage structure for the American farmer and the American workingman as it breaks down tariff barriers abroad, we have gone into all kinds of experiments of a purely aesthetic nature. The social uplift looms largely in the New Deal planning, music, theatricals, and art, are to be substituted in the new scheme of

things for the square deal and square meals earned through honest labor in agriculture and industry.

Boondoggling and labor racketeering, such as only a Machiavelli could have conjured up, have become the order of the day. Inefficiency and waste in Government administration is apparent on every side. How long, gentlemen, can this mad game keep up? Gentlemen, how long can we continue this mad orgy of spending? It will not be long, Mr. Majority Leader, before this Nation of ours will surely sink, just as was stated in the quotation I gave a few moments ago from the statement made by the President of the United States.

Now, let me quote again from the President's message to Congress on March 10, 1933:

And on my part I ask you very simply to assign to me the task of reducing the annual operating expenses of our National Government. We must move with a direct and resolute purpose now. The Members of Congress and I are pledged to immediate economy. When a great danger threatens our basic security it is my duty to advise Congress of the way to preserve it. In so doing I must be fair not only to the few but to the many. It is in this spirit that I appeal to you. If the Congress chooses to vest me with this responsibility it will be exercised in a spirit of justice to all, of sympathy to those who are in need and of maintaining inviolate the basic welfare of the United States.

We gave him the power he asked for.

When the President made that statement I think he was trying to utter at that time the words that were in his heart, but he has gone so far afield from the things that were directly responsible for the welfare of this Nation in his spending orgy that I am confident now that if we continue on with Mr. Roosevelt in the White House for 5 years more this Nation will certainly lose its form of government, and he will be a dictator in Washington just the same as Hitler is a dictator at the present time in Germany. We must not fool ourselves by thinking now that neutrality is going to take the place in the American front page of the newspapers and get us away from the fact that we are wrecking our Nation. When we come to think of the things that we are doing, it is a terrible, a horrible thing for us to realize. Let me read to you a letter that I got from a gentleman from Kane, Pa., one of my constituents. It was written on the 14th. I have not the power to give his name, and therefore I shall have to read the letter, which is exactly my idea of conditions. I shall have to omit his name:

DEAR MR. RICH: Perhaps it is a part of the New Deal idea to make so much fuss over what's going on abroad that the expenditures of that same New Deal will be soft pedaled, but the folly of such huge spending can't be drowned even in the Atlantic Ocean.

Though I know you are in full accord with my criticism of the increased cost of government since F. D. R. is in the White House, I still must write you my encouragement to fight with all your power against any unnecessary appropriations.

Fully believe that just plain common sense would get more people off relief rolls than all the schemes any government ever concocted. No doubt a part of our ills are due to excessive taxation and restriction of industry.

You've no doubt seen the report compiled by the American Federation of Investors which shows that the taxes paid by 163 representative American corporations amounted to \$2.73 on each share of the 602,683,000 shares of common stock, whereas the total amount paid in dividends by these 163 corporations to the 5,806,000 holders of common stock was equivalent to but \$1.33 per share of each common stock.

Taxes consumed 61.6 percent of the net earnings (before taxes) of the 163 companies—almost two-thirds of such earnings. Nineteen of these companies reported a deficit before taxes, while the earnings of 15 others were wiped out by taxes, leaving net deficits for the year.

Now, how are we as a nation going to prosper if we throw most of our earnings into airplanes and battleships and clerkships and post offices and dams and yardsticks—which we always lived very well without? Most of those ships will be obsolete before we ever need them, and legitimate industry with competition will give us better yardstick costs than Lillienthal's T. V. A. and a "damsite" less scandal.

Concerning the neutrality legislation, I've no objection to selling the world anything and everything they can pay for, because it's none of our business what they do with it as long as they pay for what they carry away. My great concern is to give no emergency powers to F. D. R. He'll abuse the powers and spend 10 times the amount of money necessary. That guy needs a couple of first national banks for a guardian.

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I could give quotation after quotation by Mr. Roosevelt before and since his campaign. He has made more promises to the American people and fulfilled less than any man who ever sat in the White House. Just let me ask you a few questions about the promises he made. First, before I do that, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DARDEN. I want to question the gentleman in reference to the observation, in the letter just read, about the naval shipbuilding. There was one observation toward the end in respect to naval shipbuilding. That shipbuilding is carried on in both private and Government yards, and there is a check on cost.

Mr. RICH. And I say to the gentleman that we are building three 45,000-ton battleships in the Government naval shipyards, and there is not a man in the United States who knows what they are going to cost. Even the members of the committee say they are going to cost \$95,000,000 each, but when it comes to getting the hearings on them they say they are liable to cost up to \$115,000,000. When you have such unethical bookkeeping in the Government yards that you do not know anything about the cost of an article than whether it will cost \$95,000,000 or \$115,000,000, then I say there is something rotten in Denmark with the method of the Federal Government cost of operation. The gentleman knows and I know that practically everything that the Government does costs half again as much as it would cost if done by private competition. Then, again, you have set the Government up in all of these agencies that you have established—more by President Roosevelt than by any other President in the history of the Nation, or any five Presidents—and yet Mr. Roosevelt said he did not want to set the Government up in business. Why are his promises to our people broken?

Mr. DARDEN. But come back to the 45,000-ton battleships. One of the reasons that nobody can tell just what the cost will be is that they are still being designed. They are the largest ships ever to be constructed either here or abroad. They have not yet been laid down. There has never been a single 45,000-ton battleship built.

Mr. RICH. But the money has been authorized to start them.

Mr. DARDEN. The money has been authorized to start construction.

Mr. RICH. And the gentleman voted for it at the last session of Congress.

Mr. DARDEN. I did.

Mr. RICH. And the gentleman voted for all those ships to be constructed, and whenever the President says "Go ahead and start them," they will do so. If you do not know whether a ship is going to cost \$90,000,000 or \$115,000,000, then you ought to find out what they are going to cost before you authorize them. That any sensible businessman or legislator would do.

Mr. DARDEN. But you do know that before the money is voted each year to carry on construction; the Navy does know what the cost will be?

Mr. RICH. It says in the hearings that they assume they will cost \$95,000,000. There was nobody who gave direct testimony that they would cost \$95,000,000. If they cost ninety-five or one hundred or one hundred and five or one hundred and twenty-five million dollars, after they start them they will cost a great deal more. That is the way Congress has done things since I have been in Congress. It is not good business. You know and I know the way Congress has squandered and frittered away the taxpayers' money in this country is a real crime.

Mr. DARDEN. The gentleman knows that one of them is allocated to the State of Pennsylvania, does he not?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry my time has expired, because I would like to give you some more about the expenses of this administration. I wanted to cite to you more unfilled administration promises. I will have to do that at some later time, as most of the Democrats have gone; but the majority leader is still here. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of a letter I sent to the Speaker of the House on October 4 and the reply of the Speaker to that letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RT. REV. MSGR. MICHAEL J. LAVELLE

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, last night, in the city of New York, Right Reverend Monsignor Michael J. Lavelle, one of the most celebrated and venerable characters in the history of the Catholic church, left this world. For sixty years, since his ordination, he served in but one parish, the parish of his beloved St. Patrick's Cathedral.

Monsignor Lavelle was born on May 30, 1856, at 356 Broome Street, down on the East Side of New York City, and he never left his native city. He attended the school of old St. Patrick's Cathedral, at Mulberry and Mott Streets. This school is around the corner from the famous Chinatown section and within the shadow of the Bowery. As a boy, living in that neighborhood, he learned for the first time how difficult life could be, how tragic its sufferings, how uncertain its rewards, how to the innocent came disappointment and to the ambitious, defeat. He saw at first hand the destitution and miseries of the unfortunates who were his neighbors and, as a result of these experiences, Mr. Speaker, he learned to understand the problems of life. His interest and sympathy in the welfare of the underprivileged of our city, regardless of race or creed, may be traced to those boyhood days on the sidewalks of New York.

To the confessional box of the Monsignor, father confessor to all New York, there was worn a path by penitent sinners from every section in the community who poured out their souls to him because from him they were sure of sympathy and through him, forgiveness. Recently, Monsignor Lavelle said that more than half a century as a confessor convinced him that the morals and the character of the people were improving. He had abundant faith in the future of the city because he felt that its citizens were blessed by God.

It is difficult to find words adequate to express the sorrow that is in my heart at the passing of this noble person. It was my privilege to have known him since my childhood and, during the years, I have always regarded him as a most lovable character and a citizen extraordinary who brought but honored glory to his church and to his city.

It was Macaulay who said that if one stopped under a doorway with Edmund Burke to escape a shower he would be impressed with the certainty that he had met a kindly man. That was equally true of Monsignor Lavelle. His vigorous and penetrating mind, always at work, gained for him an immense extent and variety of knowledge. He had the learning of a philosopher, and to that learning he added the manners of a gentleman.

His company was sought by non-Catholics as well as Catholics, for he was witty with a subtle sense of humor and a keen knowledge of proportion. He had an inexhaustible sense of discourse with constant cheerfulness and high spirits. It has been truly said that Monsignor Lavelle did more in his lifetime than any other contemporary churchman to promote understanding and good-will toward the Catholic Church on the part of non-Catholics. His charm of manner, his musical voice, his unexcelled diction, his general knowledge made him a personality at once outstanding, remarkable, and pleasing.

During all of his adult life no great cause affecting his church or his country was discussed upon which he did not spread the luster of his talents and the spell of his eloquence. The venerable monsignor was the possessor of a unique record, in that he served the entire period of his priesthood in one parish. Another unusual distinction was that of having celebrated his diamond jubilee, the sixtieth anniversary of his

ordination to the priesthood. Not more than three or four priests in the whole history of the archdiocese were ever privileged to celebrate a like event.

On June 6, 1939, at a celebration in honor of his diamond jubilee, President Roosevelt wrote him this letter:

My DEAR MONSIGNOR LAVELLE: Please allow me the pleasure of joining with others of your myriad friends in extending heartfelt congratulations on the happy occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of your priesthood.

What a long life of varied good works yours has been, and how remarkable that your entire ministry of threescore years all has been with the great cathedral church to which you were assigned after you received the holy orders in 1879.

As the devoted pastor of a large and important congregation who has also been active in the cause of education and civic betterment and ever sympathetic to the cry of the poor and friendless, your long life has been rounded out in manifold activities in behalf of God and country and your fellow men.

I am glad that you enjoy such a measure of good health, and I hope that your remaining years may be many. Particularly I congratulate you on possessing that rare zest for life and work which has carried you well past the fourscore mark, young in all save years.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT.

In addition to this splendid tribute from the President of the United States, Monsignor Lavelle received scores of tributes from other prominent citizens. I shall mention only a few: His Excellency Archbishop Francis J. Spellman; Gov. Herbert H. Lehman; former Gov. Alfred E. Smith; and Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia. One of the principal speakers at the Jubilee Dinner, given at the Hotel Commodore in New York City, was Postmaster General James A. Farley, and during his address, Mr. Farley said:

Monsignor Lavelle, with that rare vision given to few, must have foreseen what was coming, for his whole life has exemplified that cooperative service which in the last decade has become so prevalent among the influential men and women of America, whether they be churchmen, industrialists, labor leaders, or public servants. He, in the distant past, was a pioneer in a field where now he numbers as coworkers many who were not born until long after his labors began. It has been his good fortune to see the struggle of a few hardy souls become the pattern for the many. He as a young man took part in the prologue of the drama that now, in its last act, is approaching the happy ending. May God spare him, so that in the epilogue he may actively be part of the successful culmination, the attainment of which will have been due to the efforts of such unselfish and tireless workers as has been this man of Christ, Monsignor Lavelle.

A purse containing a large sum of money was presented to him on this occasion. But, characteristically, Monsignor Lavelle, before accepting it, insisted that it be used only for his personal charities. This purse represented offerings from the humble citizens of his old neighborhood as well as from the most affluent citizens of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this holy man knew that his end was approaching and recently wrote to Archbishop Spellman asking him to "offer up a fervent prayer to our good God that He may be merciful to me." A humble request from a humble soul. My colleagues, the following incident, which I quote from the statement made last night by Archbishop Spellman, is typical of the character of Monsignor Lavelle:

A few days ago when, at his request, I gave an absolution and a blessing, I told him that it was my intention to have his mortal remains placed in a crypt at St. Patrick's Cathedral. He smiled with joy and with gratitude when I said that I did not feel I was creating too much of a precedent in bestowing this distinction on one who had given 60 years of his priestly service in the mother church of the archdiocese of New York.

In spite of his long priestly service in the great cathedral church of St. Patrick and of the many honors that had been conferred upon him by three of the Supreme Pontiffs, he gave a final demonstration of his humble character by a smile of gratitude at the news that he was to be so singly honored by burial within the walls of the cathedral to which he gave his life in the service of God. Time may dim our memory of him, but while the walls of St. Patrick's stand, his name will be, as the phrase goes, "Ad perpetuam rei memoriam."

He has gone to his reward having fought a good fight. From high and low, from far and near, tributes are coming, and will continue to come, sent by men and women of all religions expressing their sorrow at his passing. The sorrow of the city of New York at the passing of Monsignor Lavelle is deep and finds expression in the editorials of our press.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial from the Somerset Daily American.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 19, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII,

Mr. McDOWELL introduced a resolution (H. Res. 316) authorizing the appointment of a special committee to study various United States statutes, which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5804. By Mr. DURHAM: Petition of 400 citizens from Greensboro, N. C., concerning neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5805. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of sundry citizens of Plymouth, Ind., and vicinity, and members of Local Union No. B-9, International Brotherhood Electrical Workers, urging the strict neutrality of this country and retention of the present arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5806. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of residents of Elk County, Pa., protesting against any revision of the existing Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5807. Also, petition of sundry residents of Franklin, Pa., and Oil City, Pa., asking retention of present Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5808. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Mrs. John P. Rice, secretary, Fairview Grange, No. 446, Chester, W. Va., urging that we do all we can to keep the United States neutral and to guard against sending our young men to the battlefields of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5809. By Mr. VREELAND: Resolution by the New York Board of Trade, expressing the hope that out of the debates and conferences in the Congress now assembled there will come an act that, while it may forbid the carriage by ships of American registry of items enumerated in the present Neutrality Act, will otherwise conform to international law and keep our country neutral without setting up artificial and impractical barriers that will cut off this country from trade intercourse with much of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5810. Also, statement of the Maritime Association of the port of New York, regarding the effect of the proposed Neutrality Act on American commerce and shipping; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5811. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Legion, Macon, Ga., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the establishment of a token of peace and union as set forth in the plan of the Andersonville Memorial Association; to the Committee on the Library.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who hast created us in Thine own image and hast revealed unto us the perfection of Thy nature and Thy purpose in the manhood of Thine